arXiv:1402.2388v1 [math.DG] 11 Feb 2014

COMPACTNESS OF ALEXANDROV-NIRENBERG SURFACES

QING HAN, JIAXING HONG, AND GENGGENG HUANG

Abstract. We study a class of compact surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ introduced by Alexandrov and generalized by Nirenberg and prove a compactness result under suitable assumptions on induced metrics and Gauss curvatures.

1. Introduction

Compactness plays an important role in many subjects of mathematics. With the compactness of certain classes of geometric or analytic objects, one can take limits in appropriate topology and, by analyzing the limits, obtain desired properties of the entire classes. Nirenberg [25] proved that the class of smooth closed convex surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is compact in C^k-topology, for any positive integer $k \geq 3$. This result plays an important role in his solution of the Weyl problem, concerning the isometric embedding of smooth metrics on $\mathbb{S}^2$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Isometric embedding is a classical problem in differential geometry. In 1916, Weyl [29] studied whether every smooth metric on $\mathbb{S}^2$ with positive Gauss curvature admits a smooth isometric embedding in $\mathbb{R}^3$. This problem, now referred to as the Weyl problem, was solved by Nirenberg [25] and Pogorelov [27] independently in the early 1950s. In 1990s, Guan and Li [5], and Hong and Zuily [20] independently generalized this result to metrics on $\mathbb{S}^2$ with nonnegative Gauss curvature.

Closely related to the global isometric embedding problem is the rigidity question. The first rigidity result was proved by Cohn-Vossen [4] in 1927; this states that any two closed isometric analytic convex surfaces are congruent to each other. In 1943, Herglotz [16] gave a short proof of the rigidity, assuming that the surfaces are three times continuously differentiable. In 1962 it was extended by Sacksteder [28] to surfaces with no more than two times continuously differentiable metrics.

It is natural to study the isometric embedding and the rigidity for surfaces with Gauss curvature of mixed sign. For rigidity, Alexandrov [2] in 1938 introduced a class of surfaces satisfying some integral condition for its Gauss curvature and proved that any compact analytic surface with this condition is rigid. In 1963, Nirenberg [26] generalized this result to smooth surfaces under extra assumptions.

For the global isometric embedding of metrics defined on general compact surfaces, Han and Lin [13] recently made the first attempt and discussed the isometric embedding of metrics defined on torus. They found obstructions to the existence of such isometric embedding. Specifically, they found a one-parameter family of analytic metrics which are

The first author acknowledges the support of NSF Grant DMS-1105321. The second and the third authors acknowledge the support of NNSF Grants 11121101 and 11131005.

small perturbations of the standard metric on torus and do not admit any C^2 isometric embedding in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

We should point out that vanishing Gauss curvature causes serious problems even for the local isometric embedding of 2-dimensional Riemannian metrics in $\mathbb{R}^3$. In 1985 and 1986, Lin [21], [22] proved the existence of sufficiently smooth local isometric embedding if the Gauss curvature is nonnegative or the Gauss curvature changes sign cleanly. For other results on local isometric embedding, refer to [8], [9], [11] and [12].

As is well-known, a closed surface M in $\mathbb{R}^3$ satisfies

$$\int_M K^+ dg \geq 4\pi, \tag{1.1}$$

where K is the Gauss curvature of M and K^+ is its positive part, i.e., $K^+ = \max\{0, K\}$. This simply says that the image of the Gauss map on $\{p \in M : K > 0\}$ covers the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ at least once. Such an integral condition provides an obstruction for the existence of isometric embedding of metrics on closed surfaces.

Alexandrov [2] and Nirenberg [26] studied oriented closed surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ satisfying the equality in (1.1) and proved the rigidity under appropriate non-degeneracy condition for the Gauss curvature. Since (1.1) involves the part of the surface where Gauss curvature is positive, we will formulate results by Alexandrov and Nirenberg accordingly as follows. Refer to [26], or [10], for a proof.

Theorem A. *Let Σ be an oriented and bounded C^4-surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with nonempty boundary. Suppose*

$$\begin{aligned} &K > 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma, \\ &K = 0 \text{ and } \nabla K \neq 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Sigma, \\ &\int_\Sigma K dg = 4\pi. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Then,

(1) *$\partial\Sigma$ consists of finitely many smooth planar convex curves σ_j, $j = 1, ..., J$. Moreover, the plane containing σ_j is tangent to Σ along σ_j, for each $j = 1, \cdots, J$;*

(2) *the geodesic curvature k_g of σ_j is negative, for each $j = 1, \cdots, J$;*

(3) *$\Sigma \bigcup \partial\Sigma$ is rigid.*

In this paper, we initiate our study of surfaces introduced by Alexandrov and Nirenberg, as in Theorem A. For convenience, we introduce the following terminology.

Definition 1.1. We call Σ an *Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface* if it satisfies (1.2).

Our ultimate goal is to study the isometric embedding related to Alexandrov-Nirenberg surfaces. The rigidity result in Theorem A(3) can be interpreted as the uniqueness of the isometric embedding. We are interested in the existence of the related isometric embedding. If we attempt to employ the method of continuity to prove the existence of such an isometric embedding, a necessary step is to prove the closedness of the embeddable metrics, or the compactness of the associated surfaces.

The main result of the present paper is the following compactness result.

Theorem 1.2. *For each integers $J \geq 1$ and $k \geq 2$, a constant $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and a positive constant C, let $\mathcal{S}_{J,k,\alpha,C}$ be the collection of Alexandrov-Nirenberg surfaces Σ of class $C^{k+3,\alpha}$, with J connected components in $\partial\Sigma$, such that*

$$|g|_{C^{k+2,\alpha}(\bar{\Sigma})} + \max_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{1}{|\nabla K|} + \max_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{1}{|k_g|} \leq C,$$

where g is the induced metric on Σ, K is the Gauss curvature of Σ and k_g is the geodesic curvature of $\partial\Sigma$. Then, $\mathcal{S}_{J,k,\alpha,C}$ is compact in the C^k-topology.

We note that ∇K does not vanish on $\partial\Sigma$ by (1.2) and that k_g does not vanish on $\partial\Sigma$ by Theorem A(2).

Theorem 1.2 is based on a priori estimates of the $C^{k,\alpha}$-norms of the position vectors of Σ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ or its associated second fundamental form. Difficulties in deriving such estimates arise from the condition that curvature $K = 0$ on $\partial\Sigma$. As is well known, vanishing Gauss curvature results in degeneracy of the associated nonlinear elliptic equations. In [17] and [19], Hong studied the case where $\partial\Sigma$ consists of one connected component and the geodesic curvature k_g of $\partial\Sigma$ is positive everywhere. For more bibliography, see [10]. However, in our present case, $k_g < 0$ on $\partial\Sigma$ by Theorem A(2). From an analytic point of view, the associated elliptic equation is non-characteristically degenerate on $\partial\Sigma$ if $k_g > 0$ on $\partial\Sigma$ and is characteristically degenerate if $k_g < 0$. The latter is presumably more difficult to study than the former. For the characteristically degenerate elliptic equations in this paper, the usual barrier arguments do not seem to work for the estimate of the difference-quotient along the normal to the degenerate boundary, although derivatives of solutions on the boundary can be solved from the equation. This is the major difficulty we encounter in the present paper.

To prove Theorem 1.2, we need to derive a priori estimates of the second fundamental forms. The crucial part is the estimate of the boundary Lipschitz norm. We achieve this in three successive steps:

Step 1. Estimate the L^∞-norm by the maximum principle;

Step 2. Estimate the boundary Hölder norm by de Giorgi iteration;

Step 3. Estimate the boundary Lipschitz norm by blowup arguments.

The method used in Step 2 and Step 3 is of independent interest.

After deriving the boundary Lipschitz norm of the second fundamental form, we obtain estimates of the boundary higher order norm by results in [18] on L^p and Hölder boundary estimates for a class of characteristically degenerate elliptic equations.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we derive a global upper bound of the mean curvature and an interior estimate of higher order derivatives of position vectors for Alexandrov-Nirenberg surfaces. In Section 3, we derive some important equations in geodesic coordinates near boundary. In Section 4, we derive upper and lower bounds of the mean curvature by the maximum principle. We derive boundary Hölder norms of the second fundamental form by de Giorgi iteration in Section 5 and boundary Lipschitz norms by blowup arguments in Section 6. In Section 7, we provide an estimate of higher order derivatives of the second fundamental form and prove Theorem 1.2. Section 8 is an appendix, where we reformulate results in [18] for our applications.

2. Interior Estimates

In this section, we derive a global upper bound of the mean curvature and an interior estimate of higher order derivatives of position vectors for Alexandrov-Nirenberg surfaces.

Suppose Σ is an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface as introduced in Definition 1.1. By Theorem A, $\partial\Sigma$ consists of finitely many planar convex curves. Let σ be a connected component in $\partial\Sigma$. Without loss of generality, we assume that, in the geodesic coordinates with the base curve σ, the induced metric g is of the form

$$g = B^2 ds^2 + dt^2 \quad \text{for any } (s,t) \in [0,2\pi] \times [0,1], \tag{2.1}$$

where B is a positive function in $[0,2\pi] \times [0,1]$ satisfying

$$B(\cdot,0) = 1, \quad B_t(\cdot,0) = -k_g. \tag{2.2}$$

Here, $t = 0$ corresponds to the boundary curve σ and the negative sign in B_t indicates that the geodesic curvature of σ is calculated with respect to the anticlockwise orientation. Obviously, we have $B_t > 0$ on σ. Furthermore, we assume, by a scaling in t if necessary, that

$$B_t > 0 \ \text{ for all } t \in [0,1].$$

Throughout the paper, we adopt the notion $(\partial_s, \partial_t) = (\partial_1, \partial_2)$. It is easy to calculate

$$\begin{aligned} &\Gamma^1_{11} = \frac{B_s}{B}, \qquad \Gamma^1_{12} = \frac{B_t}{B}, \quad \Gamma^1_{22} = 0, \\ &\Gamma^2_{11} = -BB_t, \quad \Gamma^2_{12} = 0, \qquad \Gamma^2_{22} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The Gauss-Codazzi equations are given by

$$L_t - M_s = \frac{B_t}{B} L - \frac{B_s}{B} M + BB_t N, \tag{2.3}$$

$$M_t - N_s = -\frac{B_t}{B} M, \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$NL - M^2 = KB^2. \tag{2.5}$$

Note that the mean curvature H is given by

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{L}{B^2} + N\right). \tag{2.6}$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^4 and σ be a connected component in $\partial\Sigma$. Then, in the geodesic coordinates as in* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*,*

$$L = M = 0, \quad N = \sqrt{\frac{K_t}{B_t}} \quad \text{on } t = 0,$$

and

$$L_t = \sqrt{K_t B_t} \quad \text{on } t = 0.$$

Proof. We first note $K = 0$ and $L = M = 0$ as $t = 0$ since the normal to Σ is constant along σ. By (2.3) and t-differentiation of (2.5), we have

$$L_t = NB_t, \quad NL_t = K_t \quad \text{at } t = 0.$$

Solving the above system yields expressions of N and L_t on $t = 0$. □

By Lemma 2.1, L, M, N and L_t are intrinsically determined on σ.

Corollary 2.2. *Let k be a nonnegative integer, Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^{k+4} and σ be a connected component in $\partial\Sigma$. Then, in the geodesic coordinates as in* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*, all k-derivatives of M and N and $(k+1)$-derivatives of L are intrinsically determined on σ.*

Proof. We will prove by induction that, for any integer $m = 0, 1, \cdots, k$,

$$\partial^m L, \partial^m M, \partial^m N \text{ and } \partial_t^{m+1} L \text{ are intrinsically determined on } \sigma.$$

Here ∂^m denotes all derivatives of order m. Note that $m = 0$ corresponds to Lemma 2.1. We assume it holds for $m-1$ and consider m for some $m \geq 1$. Since pure s-derivatives of $\partial^{m-1}L, \partial^{m-1}M, \partial^{m-1}N$ and $\partial_t^m L$ are intrinsically determined on σ, we consider only $\partial_t^{m+1}L$, $\partial_t^m M$ and $\partial_t^m N$. First, $\partial_t^m M$ is intrinsically determined on σ by (2.4). Next, a differentiation of (2.3) and (2.5) with respect to t of appropriate order yields

$$\partial_t^{m+1}L - BB_t\partial_t^m N = \cdots, \quad N\partial_t^{m+1}L + m\partial_t L\partial_t^m N = \cdots,$$

where $\cdots$ indicates expressions intrinsically determined on σ. Here we used $L = M = 0$ on σ. The coefficient matrix at $t = 0$ is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -B_t \\ \sqrt{\frac{K_t}{B_t}} & m\sqrt{K_t B_t} \end{pmatrix},$$

which is nonsigular. Hence, $\partial_t^{m+1}L$ and $\partial_t^m N$ are intrinsically determined on σ. □

Corollary 2.3. *Let k be a nonnegative integer, Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^{k+4} and σ be a connected component in $\partial\Sigma$. Then, in the geodesic coordinates as in* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*, all k-derivatives of the mean curvature H are intrinsically determined on σ.*

Next, for the Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface Σ in $\mathbb{R}^3$, we assume by Theorem A(1) that $\partial\Sigma$ consists of J planar convex curves. Hence, Σ and the planar convex regions enclosed by these curves form a convex surface $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. We first have the following result.

Lemma 2.4. *There exists a ball of radius R_0 inside $\widetilde{\Sigma}$, where R_0 is a positive constant depending only on $1/\max K$ and the intrinsic diameter l of Σ.*

For a proof, refer to [3] or [10] p196. In the following, we always take the origin as the center of this ball.

We fix a bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with J connected components in ∂D. Then, the induced metric g of $\bar{\Sigma}$ can be viewed as a metric in $\bar{D}$ and $\bar{\Sigma}$ an isometric embedding of $(\bar{D}, g)$. Let $\mathbf{r}$ be the position vector of Σ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and set

$$\rho = -\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{r}|^2.$$

We always regard $\mathbf{r}$ and all related functions as defined in $\bar{D}$.

Lemma 2.5. *There hold*

$$Kh^{ij}\rho_{ij} = -2H - 2K\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{n}, \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$(\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{n})^2 + |\nabla\rho|^2 = |\mathbf{r}|^2. \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. For any $p \in D$, we take the orthonormal coordinates at p. Then a straightforward calculation yields

$$\rho_{ij} = -\mathbf{r}_i\cdot\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_{ij}\cdot\mathbf{r} = -\delta_{ij} - h_{ij}\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{n}, \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$Kh^{ij}\rho_{ij} = -Kh^{ij}\delta_{ij} - Kh^{ij}h_{ij}\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{n} = -2H - 2K\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{n}.$$

This proves the first part. As for the second part, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbf{r}|^2 - (\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{n})^2 = |\mathbf{r}\times\mathbf{n}|^2 &= \left|\mathbf{r}\times\frac{\mathbf{r}_1\times\mathbf{r}_2}{|\mathbf{r}_1\times\mathbf{r}_2|}\right|^2\\ &= \left|\frac{(\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{r}_1)\mathbf{r}_2 - (\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{r}_2)\mathbf{r}_1}{|\mathbf{r}_1\times\mathbf{r}_2|}\right|^2 = g^{ij}\rho_i\rho_j.\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. □

Now we prove an upper bound of the mean curvature.

Lemma 2.6. *Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^5. Then,*

$$H \le C\left\{\max_{\partial\Sigma}\sqrt{\frac{|\nabla K|}{|k_g|}} + \max_{\Sigma} K + \max_{\Sigma}\sqrt{|\Delta K|}\right\},$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on the intrinsic diameter of Σ.

Similar estimates were obtained in [25] and [31] for closed surfaces with positive Gauss curvature and in [5] and [20] for closed surfaces with nonnegative Gauss curvature. Lemma 2.6 extends these results to surfaces with boundary, where Gauss curvature vanishes.

Proof. By our convention, the induced metric g and all related functions are defined in $\bar{D}\subset\mathbb{R}^2$. First, we recall a differential equation satisfied by H. For any $p\in D$, we take the orthonormal coordinates at p and then have

$$Kh^{ij}H_{ij} = (h_{12,l}h_{12,l} - h_{11,l}h_{22,l}) + 2KH^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta K - 4K^2) \quad \text{at } p, \tag{2.10}$$

where h_{ij} is the coefficient of the second fundamental form of $\mathbf{r}$, $i,j=1,2$, and (h^{ij}) is the inverse matrix of (h_{ij}). See [25], [31] or [10] p182 for a derivation. Set $w = He^{-\lambda\rho}$ for a constant λ to be fixed. Then w satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}e^{\lambda\rho}Kh^{ij}w_{ij} + 2\lambda e^{\lambda\rho}Kh^{ij}\rho_i w_j &= (h_{12,l}h_{12,l} - h_{11,l}h_{22,l})\\ &\quad + 2KH^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta K - 4K^2) - \lambda HKh^{ij}\rho_{ij} - \lambda^2 HKh^{ij}\rho_i\rho_j,\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

at any point where the orthonormal coordinates are taken.

Suppose w attains its maximum over $\bar{D}$ at some point p. If $p \in \partial D$, then Lemma 2.1 yields

$$w = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\lambda\rho}\left(N + \frac{L}{B^2}\right) = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\lambda\rho}\sqrt{\frac{K_t}{B_t}}. \tag{2.12}$$

If $p \in D$, we take the orthonormal coordinates at p and then have

$$w_i = 0 \text{ and } Kh^{ij}w_{ij} \leq 0 \text{ at } p. \tag{2.13}$$

Without loss of generality we may assume $h_{12}(p) = 0$. Consequently, we obtain at p

$$0 = e^{\lambda\rho}w_l = H_l - \lambda H\rho_l = \frac{1}{2}(h_{11,l} + h_{22,l}) - \lambda H\rho_l,$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} h_{12,l}h_{12,l} - h_{11,l}h_{22,l} &= \sum_{l=1}^{2}\left((h_{12,l})^2 + (h_{11,l})^2\right) - 2\lambda h_{11,l}H\rho_l \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{2}\left((h_{12,l})^2 + (h_{11,l} - \lambda H\rho_l)^2\right) - \lambda^2H^2|\nabla\rho|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.7) and (2.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &- \lambda HKh^{ij}\rho_{ij} - \lambda^2HKh^{ij}\rho_i\rho_j \\ &= 2\lambda H^2 + 2\lambda HK\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{n} - \lambda^2HKh^{ij}\rho_i\rho_j \\ &\geq 2\lambda H^2 - 4\lambda^2H^2|\nabla\rho|^2 - 2\lambda HK|\mathbf{r}|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus inserting all the above estimates into (2.11) with the aid of (2.13) yields, at p,

$$\frac{1}{2}(4K^2 - \Delta K) \geq 2(\lambda - 3|\nabla\rho|^2\lambda^2)H^2 - 2\lambda HK|\mathbf{r}|.$$

Let l be the intrinsic diameter of $\bar{D}$ in g. Then, (2.8) implies $|\nabla\rho| \leq |\mathbf{r}| \leq l$. Therefore, we get at p

$$\frac{1}{4}(4K^2 - \Delta K) \geq \lambda(1 - 3\lambda l^2)H^2 - \lambda lHK.$$

Choosing $\lambda = 1/4l^2$, we have at p

$$4l^2(4K^2 - \Delta K) \geq H^2 - 4lHK.$$

This yields at p

$$H \leq 10l\big(K + \sqrt{|\Delta K|}\big),$$

or

$$w \leq 10le^{-\lambda\rho}\big(K + \sqrt{|\Delta K|}\big).$$

This yields the desired result. □

Next, we derive interior estimates of higher derivatives of position vectors. Heinz [15] derived such interior estimates if D is a disk, namely, if ∂D consists of one connected component. Next, we provide a direct proof for interior estimates in the general setting.

Set

$$\rho = -\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{r}|^2.$$

By (2.9), we have

$$\det(\rho_{ij} + \delta_{ij}) = K(-2\rho - |\nabla\rho|^2), \tag{2.14}$$

and

$$-2\rho - |\nabla\rho|^2 = |-\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{n}|^2 \geq R_0^2, \tag{2.15}$$

by the geometric meaning of the Minkowski function $-\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{n}$ and Lemma 2.4.

Theorem 2.7. *Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface of class C^5 in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with the induced metric g defined on $\bar{D}$ and let $\mathbf{r}$ be the position vector of Σ. Then for any subdomain $D' \subset\subset D_1 \subset\subset D$, the principal curvatures k_i satisfy*

$$k_i \geq \frac{1}{C} \quad \text{in } D', \tag{2.16}$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on

$$|g|_{C^4(\bar{D})},\ \frac{1}{\min_{\partial D} k_g},\ \frac{1}{\min_{D'} K}. \tag{2.17}$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $\alpha \in (0,1)$ depending only on the quantities in (2.17) such that, if Σ is C^{k+3}, for some $k \geq 2$, then

$$|D^2\mathbf{r}|_{C^{k,\alpha}(\overline{D}')} \leq C,$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on

$$k,\ |g|_{C^{k+2}(\bar{D})},\ \frac{1}{\min_{\partial D} k_g},\ \frac{1}{\inf_{D_1} K},\ \frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}(D', \partial D_1)}.$$

Proof. Let k_1 and k_2 be principal curvatures. First we note

$$k_i \leq 2H.$$

Hence, k_1 and k_2 are bounded from above by Lemma 2.6. Moreover,

$$k_1 = \frac{K}{k_2} \geq \frac{1}{2\max H} \inf_{\bar{D}'} K \geq \frac{1}{C_{D'}}. \tag{2.18}$$

Hence, k_1 and k_2 have a positive lower bound in D'. In particular, the second fundamental form has a positive lower bound in D'. Suppose that $D' \subset\subset D_1 \subset\subset D$. Then the second fundamental form h_{ij} of the given surface $\mathbf{r}$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{C_*} I \leq \big(h_{ij}\big) \leq C_* I \quad \text{in } D_1, \tag{2.19}$$

where C_* is a positive constant depending only

$$|g|_{C^4(\bar{D})}, \quad \frac{1}{\min_{\partial D} k_g}, \quad \frac{1}{\min_{D_1} K}. \tag{2.20}$$

In view of (2.9) again, it follows that

$$\nabla_{ij}\rho = h_{ij}\sqrt{-2\rho - |\nabla\rho|^2} - g_{ij} \tag{2.21}$$

are bounded in D. Note

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial(\nabla_{ij}\rho)}\left(\det\left(\nabla_{ij}\rho + \delta_{ij}\right)\right) = Kh^{ij}(-2\rho - |\nabla\rho|^2).$$

A covariant differentiation of (2.14) yields, for $l = 1, 2$,

$$K(-2\rho - |\nabla\rho|^2)h^{ij}\nabla_l\nabla_{ij}\rho = \nabla_l\big(K(-2\rho - |\nabla\rho|^2)\big).$$

Hence by the Ricci, identity we have, for $l = 1, 2$,

$$h^{ij}\nabla_{ij}\rho_l = \frac{\nabla_l\big(K(-2\rho - |\nabla\rho|^2)\big)}{K(-2\rho - |\nabla\rho|^2)} - h^{ij}\rho_m R_{mlij} \equiv g_l \quad \text{in } D_1. \tag{2.22}$$

Obviously, g_l, $l = 1, 2$ are bounded in D_1 by (2.19) and (2.15). Moreover, (2.19) implies that (2.22) is uniformly elliptic with bounded coefficients in two dimensional space. Now by Theorem 12.4 in [7], we have, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$[\rho_l]_{C^{1,\alpha}(D')} \le C(1 + |g_l|_{L^\infty(D_1)}) \le C_1,$$

where $\alpha = \alpha(C_*) \in (0, 1)$ and C, C_1 are positive constants depending only on the quantities in (2.20). Therefore combining the above inequalities with the structure equations

$$\mathbf{r}_{ij} = \Gamma^k_{ij}\mathbf{r}_k + h_{ij}\mathbf{n} = \Gamma^k_{ij}\mathbf{r}_k + \frac{\nabla_{ij}\rho + g_{ij}}{\sqrt{-2\rho - |\nabla\rho|^2}}\mathbf{n},$$

we obtain

$$|D^2\mathbf{r}|_{C^\alpha(D')} \le C,$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on the quantities in (2.20).

Combining the standard regular theory of elliptic equations with the structure equations, we have, for $k \ge 2$,

$$|D^k\rho|_{C^\alpha(\overline{D}')}, + |D^k\mathbf{r}|_{\mathbf{C}^\alpha(\overline{\mathbf{D}}')} \le\le \mathbf{C},$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on

$$k,\ |g|_{C^{k+2}(\bar{D})},\ \frac{1}{\min_{\partial D} k_g},\ \frac{1}{\inf_{D_1} K},\ \frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}(D', \partial D_1)}.$$

This is the desired estimate. □

3. Gauss-Codazzi Equations near Boundary

Suppose Σ is an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface as introduced in Definition 1.1. The primary goal in this paper is to derive estimates of the second fundamental form near the boundary $\partial\Sigma$.

Let σ be a connected component in $\partial\Sigma$ and L, M and N be the coefficients of the second fundamental form in the geodesic coordinates as in (2.1) and (2.2) near σ. In this section, we derive differential equations of $1/N$ and M. We first derive an equation of $1/N$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^5 and σ be a connected component in $\partial\Sigma$. Then, in the geodesic coordinates as in* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*, with $(\partial_1, \partial_2) = (\partial_s, \partial_t)$,*

$$a^{ij}\partial_{ij}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + \frac{A_i}{N}\partial_i\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) = \frac{A_0}{N^2}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\partial_i\left(a^{ij}\partial_j\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)\right) + \frac{\widetilde{A}_i}{N}\partial_i\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) = \frac{A_0}{N^2}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\partial_i\left(Na^{ij}\partial_j\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)\right) + \widetilde{A}_i\partial_i\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right) = \frac{2A_0}{N^2}, \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$a^{11} = N, \quad a^{12} = -M, \quad a^{22} = L,$$

and $A_1, A_2, \widetilde{A}_1, \widetilde{A}_2$ and A_0 are polynomials of M, N, B, B^{-1}, K and derivatives of B, K, with $A_1, A_2, \widetilde{A}_1, \widetilde{A}_2$ involving derivatives of B, K of order 1 and A_0 involving derivatives up to order 2. Moreover,

$$A_2 = 2K_tB^2 + BB_tN^2 - \frac{4B_t}{B}M^2 + 4BB_tK, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\widetilde{A}_2 = 2K_tB^2 + \frac{B_s}{B}MN - \frac{5B_t}{B}M^2 + 3BB_tK. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. By (2.5), we have

$$L = \frac{M^2 + KB^2}{N}.$$

This makes sense in a neighborhood of σ in Σ as $N > 0$ there by Lemma 2.1. Then (2.3) and (2.4) are reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} -LN_t + 2MN_s - NM_s + Q &= 0, \\ M_t - N_s + \frac{B_t}{B}M &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$Q = -\frac{2B_t}{B}M^2 - \frac{B_t}{B}\big(M^2 + KB^2\big) + \frac{B_s}{B}MN - BB_tN^2 + (B^2K)_t.$$

We differentiate the first and second equations in t and in s respectively and add the first resulted equation and the N-multiple of the second equation. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} -LN_{tt} + 2MN_{st} - NN_{ss} + 2M_tN_s - L_tN_t - N_tM_s \\ + \frac{B_t}{B}NM_s + \left(\frac{B_t}{B}\right)_s MN + Q_t = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note, by (3.6)

$$\begin{aligned} M_s &= \frac{2M}{N}N_s - \frac{L}{N}N_t + \frac{Q}{N}, \\ M_t &= N_s - \frac{B_t}{B}M. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by (2.3),

$$L_t = M_s + \frac{B_t}{B}L - \frac{B_s}{B}M + BB_tN.$$

By a simple substitution of L_t, M_s and M_t, we have

$$-LN_{tt} + 2MN_{st} - NN_{ss} + \frac{2L}{N}N_t^2 - \frac{4M}{N}N_sN_t + 2N_s^2 - I = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I = \frac{2B_t}{B}MN_s + \frac{2Q}{N}N_t + \left(\frac{B_t}{B}\frac{M^2+KB^2}{N} - \frac{B_s}{B}M + BB_tN\right)N_t \\ - \frac{B_t}{B}NM_s - \left(\frac{B_t}{B}\right)_s MN - Q_t. \end{aligned}$$

By substituting M_s and M_t by N_s and N_t, we note that I is linear in N_s and N_t and hence can be put in the form

$$I = \frac{A_1}{N}N_s + \frac{A_2}{N}N_t + A_0,$$

where A_1, A_2 and A_0 are polynomials of M, N, B, B^{-1}, K and derivatives of B, K, with A_1, A_2 involving derivatives of B, K of order 1 and A_0 involving derivatives up to order 2. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} -LN_{tt} + 2MN_{st} - NN_{ss} + \frac{2L}{N}N_t^2 - \frac{4M}{N}N_sN_t + 2N_s^2 \\ - \frac{A_1}{N}N_s - \frac{A_2}{N}N_t - A_0 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

In the following, we need an explicit expression of A_2. Indeed, by the expression of Q and a straightforward calculation, we obtain (3.4).

By dividing (3.7) by $1/N^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L\partial_{tt}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) - 2M\partial_{ts}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + N\partial_{ss}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \\ + \frac{A_2}{N}\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + \frac{A_1}{N}\partial_s\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) - \frac{A_0}{N^2} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

This is (3.1). We can also express (3.8) in divergence form

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t\left[L\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) - M\partial_s\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)\right] + \partial_s\left[N\partial_s\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) - M\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)\right] \\ + \frac{\widetilde{A}_2}{N}\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + \frac{\widetilde{A}_1}{N}\partial_s\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) - \frac{A_0}{N^2} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\widetilde{A}_1 = A_1 + N(M_t - N_s), \quad \widetilde{A}_2 = A_2 - N(L_t - M_s).$$

This yields (3.2) and (3.5) by (2.3) and (2.4).

Last, (3.3) follows from (3.2). □

Remark 3.2. The explicit expressions of A_2 and $\widetilde{A}_2$ play an important role in the estimate of $1/N$. We note that, for any $t \in [0, \delta]$,

$$A_2 \geq C_1 - C_2 M^2, \tag{3.10}$$

where C_1, C_2 and δ are positive constants under control. This follows easily from $K = 0$, $K_t > 0$ at $t = 0$ and $B_t > 0$ in the region considered.

Now, we consider a function $h = h(s,t)$ and derive an equation for $\frac{1}{N^2} - h$. By (3.3), we have

$$\partial_i \left(N a^{ij} \partial_j \left(\frac{1}{N^2} - h \right) \right) + \widetilde{A}_i \partial_i \left(\frac{1}{N^2} - h \right) - \frac{2A_0}{N^2} + I = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \partial_i (N a^{ij} h_j) + \widetilde{A}_i h_i \\ &= N \partial_i (a^{ij} h_j) + \widetilde{A}_i h_i + a^{ij} h_j \partial_i N. \end{aligned}$$

For the last term, we write it as

$$a^{ij} h_j \partial_i N = -\frac{1}{2} N^3 a^{ij} h_j \partial_i \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \right) = -\frac{1}{2} N^3 a^{ij} h_j \partial_i \left(\frac{1}{N^2} - h \right) - \frac{1}{2} N^3 a^{ij} h_j h_i.$$

Therefore, by a simple substitution, we obtain

$$\partial_i \left(N a^{ij} \partial_j \left(\frac{1}{N^2} - h \right) \right) + \overline{A}_i \partial_i \left(\frac{1}{N^2} - h \right) - \overline{A}_0 = 0, \tag{3.11}$$

where

$$\overline{A}_i = \widetilde{A}_i - \frac{1}{2} N^3 a^{ij} h_j,$$

and

$$\overline{A}_0 = \frac{2A_0}{N^2} - N a^{ij} h_{ij} - \big(\widetilde{A}_i + N \partial_j a^{ij} \big) h_i + \frac{1}{2} N^3 a^{ij} h_i h_j.$$

In the expression of $\overline{A}_0$, the derivatives of a^{ij} have the form

$$\partial_1 a^{11} + \partial_2 a^{21} = \partial_s N - \partial_t M, \quad \partial_1 a^{12} + \partial_2 a^{22} = \partial_t L - \partial_s M,$$

which can be substituted by the Codazzi equations (2.3)-(2.4). In the special case $h = h(s)$, we have

$$\overline{A}_1 = \widetilde{A}_1 - \frac{1}{2} N^4 h_s, \quad \overline{A}_2 = \widetilde{A}_2 + \frac{1}{2} M N^3 h_s, \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$\overline{A}_0 = \frac{2A_0}{N^2} - N^2 h_{ss} - \widetilde{A}_1 h_s - \frac{B_t}{B} M N h_s + \frac{1}{2} N^4 h_s^2. \tag{3.13}$$

Next, we derive an equation for M.

Lemma 3.3. *Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^5 and σ be a connected component in $\partial\Sigma$. Then, in the geodesic coordinates as in* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*, with $(\partial_1, \partial_2) = (\partial_s, \partial_t)$,*

$$a^{ij}\partial_{ij}M - \frac{2M}{NL}a^{ij}\partial_i M\partial_j M + \widehat{A}_i\partial_i M + \widehat{A}_0 = 0, \tag{3.14}$$

$$\partial_i(a^{ij}\partial_j M) - \frac{2M}{NL}a^{ij}\partial_i M\partial_j M + \check{A}_i\partial_i M + \widehat{A}_0 = 0, \tag{3.15}$$

where $a^{11} = N$, $a^{12} = -M$, $a^{22} = L$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{A}_0 &= \frac{1}{NL}(KB^2)_s\widehat{A}_{01} + \widehat{A}_{02}\\
\widehat{A}_1 &= \frac{2M}{NL}(B^2K_t - BB_tN^2) + \frac{4K}{L}\left(BB_t\frac{M}{N} - BB_s\right) - \frac{B^2K_s}{L} + \widehat{A}_{11},\\
\widehat{A}_2 &= \frac{2M}{NL}(KB^2)_s + \widehat{A}_{21},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$\check{A}_1 = \widehat{A}_1 - \frac{B_t}{B}M, \quad \check{A}_2 = \widehat{A}_2 - \frac{B_t}{B}L + \frac{B_s}{B}M - BB_tN,$$

and $\widehat{A}_{01}, \widehat{A}_{02}, \widehat{A}_{11}$ and $\widehat{A}_{21}$ are polynomials of M, N, N^{-1}, B, B^{-1}, K, and derivatives of B, K up to order 2.

Proof. By a simple arrangement, we write (3.6) as

$$\begin{aligned}
-LN_t + 2MM_t - NM_s + \widehat{Q} = 0,\\
M_t - N_s + \frac{B_t}{B}M = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$\widehat{Q} = (KB^2)_t - \frac{B_t}{B}(M^2 + KB^2) + \frac{B_s}{B}MN - BB_tN^2.$$

By eliminating the derivatives of N in (3.17), we will get a differential equation of M. Specifically, we differentiate the first and second equations in s and in t respectively, multiply the second and the first equations of (3.17) by L and -1, and then sum up. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
LM_{tt} - 2MM_{st} + NM_{ss} + L_sN_t + N_sM_s - 2M_sM_t\\
+\frac{B_t}{B}LM_t + \left(\frac{B_t}{B}\right)_t LM - \widehat{Q}_s = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
N_t &= \frac{2M}{L}M_t - \frac{N}{L}M_s + \frac{\widehat{Q}}{L},\\
N_s &= M_t + \frac{B_t}{B}M.
\end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$L_s = \left(\frac{M^2+KB^2}{N}\right)_s = \frac{2M}{N}M_s + \frac{1}{N}(KB^2)_s - \frac{M^2+KB^2}{N^2}N_s.$$

By substituting N_s in the expression of L_s, we have

$$L_s = \frac{2M}{N}M_s - \frac{L}{N}M_t - \frac{B_t}{B}\frac{LM}{N} + \frac{1}{N}(KB^2)_s.$$

By a simple substitution of L_s, N_s and N_t, we obtain

$$LM_{tt} - 2MM_{st} + NM_{ss} - \frac{2M}{N}M_t^2 + \frac{4M^2}{NL}M_sM_t - \frac{2M}{L}M_s^2 + \widehat{I} = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{I} = &\left(-\frac{B_t}{B}\frac{LM}{N} + \frac{1}{N}(KB^2)_s\right)\left(\frac{2M}{L}M_t - \frac{N}{L}M_s\right)\\ &+ \frac{\widehat{Q}}{L}\left(\frac{2M}{N}M_s - \frac{L}{N}M_t\right) + \frac{\widehat{Q}}{L}\left(-\frac{B_t}{B}\frac{LM}{N} + \frac{1}{N}(KB^2)_s\right)\\ &+ \frac{B_t}{B}MM_s + \frac{B_t}{B}LM_t + \left(\frac{B_t}{B}\right)_t LM - \widehat{Q}_s.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\widehat{I}$ is linear in M_s and M_t and hence can be put in the form

$$\widehat{I} = \widehat{A}_1M_s + \widehat{A}_2M_t + \widehat{A}_0,$$

for some functions $\widehat{A}_0$, $\widehat{A}_1$ and $\widehat{A}_2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}LM_{tt} - 2MM_{st} + NM_{ss} - \frac{2M}{N}M_t^2 + \frac{4M^2}{LN}M_sM_t - \frac{2M}{L}M_s^2\\ +\widehat{A}_1M_s + \widehat{A}_2M_t + \widehat{A}_0 = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

In calculating $\widehat{I}$, we need to collect terms involving L^{-1}. By the explicit expression of $\widehat{Q}$ and a straightforward calculation, we obtain (3.16). We can also write (3.18) in the divergence form

$$\begin{aligned}&(LM_t - MM_s)_t + (NM_s - MM_t)_s - \frac{2M}{NL}(LM_t^2 - 2MM_sM_t + NM_s^2)\\ &\quad + \left(\widehat{A}_1 - \frac{B_t}{B}M\right)M_s + \left(\widehat{A}_2 - \frac{B_t}{B}L + \frac{B_s}{B}M - BB_tN\right)M_t + \widehat{A}_0 = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Note that (3.18) and (3.19) are (3.14) and (3.15), respectively. □

We now analyze $\widehat{A}_0$, $\widehat{A}_1$ and $\widehat{A}_2$.

Remark 3.4. We may write

$$\widehat{A}_1 = \widehat{A}_{12}\frac{M}{L}\big(N - N(s,0)\big) + \widehat{A}_{13}.$$

Then, $\widehat{A}_{12}$, $\widehat{A}_{13}$, $\widehat{A}_0$ and $\widehat{A}_2$ are bounded by a constant depending only on

$$\sup_{0\le t\le 1,\ |\alpha|\le 2}\left\{M, N, \frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{K_t}, \frac{1}{B}, |\partial^\alpha B|, |\partial^\alpha K|\right\}. \tag{3.20}$$

To see this, we note that, by $LN = KB^2 + M^2 \geq KB^2$, we have

$$\frac{K}{L} \leq \frac{N}{B^2}.$$

By $K = 0, K_t > 0$ at $t = 0$, we have

$$K_s \leq CK \leq CL.$$

Hence, $\widehat{A}_0$, $\widehat{A}_2$ are bounded and $\widehat{A}_1$ is bounded by (3.20) except the term

$$\frac{2M}{NL}(B^2 K_t - BB_t N^2).$$

We write this as

$$-\frac{2BB_t M}{NL}\big(N^2 - N^2(s,0)\big) + \frac{2BM}{NL}\big(BK_t - B_t N^2(s,0)\big).$$

By Lemma 2.1, we have $\big(BK_t - B_t N^2\big)(s,0) = 0$ on $t = 0$. Also, since $K_t > 0$ on $t = 0$, we have $L \geq Ct$. Therefore, the second term above is bounded by (3.20). We then have the desired decomposition of $\widehat{A}_1$.

4. L^∞-estimates near Boundary

Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Starting from this section, we will estimate the second fundamental form near boundary $\partial\Sigma$. We first prove an L^∞-estimate by the maximum principle.

Lemma 4.1. *Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^5 and σ be a connected component of $\partial\Sigma$. Then, in the geodesic coordinates as in (2.1)-(2.2),*

$$0 \leq L \leq C, \quad |M| \leq C, \quad \frac{1}{C} \leq N \leq C \quad \text{for any } t \in [0, \delta_0],$$

where C and δ_0 are positive constants depending only on the quantities

$$|g|_{C^4(\Sigma)}, \quad \max_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{1}{|k_g|}, \quad \max_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{1}{|\nabla K|}. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. First, $L \geq 0$. Lemma 2.6 and (2.6) imply $N \leq C$ and $L \leq CB^2$. Then, (2.5) yields $|M| \leq \sqrt{LN} \leq CB$.

Next, in the geodesic coordinates as in (2.1) and (2.2), the normal curvature in the direction of ∂_t at p equals N. We have by (2.16), for $t = \delta_0 > 0$,

$$N = II(\partial_t, \partial_t) \geq \min\{k_1, k_2\} \geq \frac{1}{C_\delta}. \tag{4.2}$$

We now claim there exists a $\delta_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that, for any $t \in (0, \delta_0)$,

$$N \geq \frac{1}{C}, \tag{4.3}$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on those quantities in (4.1). To prove this, we set

$$\Omega_{\delta_0} = \{(s,t) : s \in [0, 2\pi],\ t \in (0, \delta_0)\}.$$

We write (3.1) as

$$L\partial_{tt}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) - 2M\partial_{ts}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + N\partial_{ss}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + \frac{A_2}{N}\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + \frac{A_1}{N}\partial_s\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) = \frac{A_0}{N^2}.$$

Since L, M, N are all bounded, then, A_1, A_2 and A_0 are bounded. Moreover, A_2 satisfies (3.10). Set

$$\phi = \frac{h}{N},$$

for a function $h = h(t)$ to be fixed. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}\phi &\equiv L\phi_{tt} - 2M\phi_{ts} + N\phi_{ss} + \left(\frac{A_1}{N} + \frac{2Mh_t}{h}\right)\phi_s + \left(\frac{A_2}{N} - \frac{2Lh_t}{h}\right)\phi_t \\ &= \frac{L}{Nh}(h_{tt}h - 2h_t^2) + A_2h_t\frac{1}{N^2} + h\frac{A_0}{N^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$h = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\lambda t}}.$$

Then, for $\lambda t < 1$,

$$\frac{h_t}{h} = \frac{\lambda}{2(1-\lambda t)}, \quad \frac{h_{tt}}{h} - \frac{2h_t^2}{h^2} = \frac{\lambda^2}{4(1-\lambda t)^2}.$$

Both expressions are positive. Hence, by (3.10), we have, for any $t \in [0, \delta]$, where δ is introduced for (3.10),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{h}\mathcal{L}\phi &\geq \frac{M^2}{N^2h^2}(h_{tt}h - 2h_t^2) + \frac{1}{N^2}(C_1 - C_2M^2)\frac{h_t}{h} + \frac{A_0}{N^2} \\ &\geq \frac{M^2}{N^2}\left(\frac{\lambda^2}{4(1-\lambda t)^2} - \frac{\lambda C_2}{2(1-\lambda t)}\right) + \frac{1}{N^2}\left(\frac{\lambda C_1}{2(1-\lambda t)} - |A_0|\right).\end{aligned}$$

Take

$$\lambda = 2C_2 + \frac{2}{C_1}\big(\max|A_0| + 1\big),$$

and then $\delta_0 = \min\{\delta, (2\lambda)^{-1}\}$. We have, for any $t \in (0, \delta_0)$,

$$\frac{1}{h}\mathcal{L}\phi \geq \frac{1}{N^2} > 0.$$

Assume that ϕ attains its maximum in $\bar{\Omega}_{\delta_0}$ at some point $p = (s_p, t_p) \in \bar{\Omega}_{\delta_0}$. The maximum principle implies that $p \in \partial\Omega_{\delta_0}$. If $t_p = \delta_0$, then (4.2) implies $N \geq 1/C_{\delta_0}$ and hence $\phi \leq \sqrt{2}C_{\delta_0}$ at p. If $t_p = 0$, Lemma 2.1 yields a similar estimate. Hence, $\phi \leq C_*$ in Ω_{δ_0} and then $N \geq 1/(\sqrt{2}C_*)$. This finishes the proof of (4.3). □

For simplicity, we will write $\delta_0 = 1$ in the following. Next, we derive an estimate of M.

Lemma 4.2. *Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^5 and σ be a connected component of $\partial\Sigma$. Then, in the geodesic coordinates as in (2.1) and (2.2),*

$$|M| \le C\sqrt{t} \quad \text{for any } t \in [0,1],$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on the quantities in (4.1).

Proof. Note that M satisfies (3.14) or (3.18). Set $m = M^2$. Multiplying both sides of (3.18) by $2M$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}(m) \equiv Lm_{tt} - 2Mm_{st} + Nm_{ss} + \widehat{A}_1 m_s + \widehat{A}_2 m_t \\ -\frac{1}{N}m_t^2 + \frac{2M}{LN}m_s m_t - \frac{1}{L}m_s^2 \ge -2\widehat{A}_0 M.\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see

$$\mathcal{R}(\lambda t) = \lambda\left(\widehat{A}_2 - \frac{\lambda}{N}\right) \le -\frac{\lambda^2}{C_1},$$

for some positive constant C_1 and sufficiently large constant λ under control since $\widehat{A}_2$ is bounded by Remark 3.4. Set

$$w = m - \lambda t.$$

By taking the difference $\mathcal{R}(m) - \mathcal{R}(\lambda t)$, we have for any $(s,t) \in [0,2\pi] \times (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}Lw_{tt} - 2Mw_{st} + Nw_{ss} + \left(\widehat{A}_1 + \frac{2Mm_t}{LN} - \frac{m_s}{L}\right) w_s \\ + \left(\widehat{A}_2 - \frac{1}{N}(m_t + \lambda)\right) w_t \ge \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{C_1} - C_2\right) > 0,\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large λ under control, since $\widehat{A}_0$ is bounded by Remark 3.4. Note that $w = 0$ as $t = 0$ and $w = m - \lambda \le 0$ as $t = 1$ by choosing λ large, since M is bounded. By the maximum principle, we conclude $w \le 0$ and hence, for any $(s,t) \in [0,2\pi] \times [0,1]$,

$$|M|^2 \le \lambda t.$$

This yields the desired result. □

Our next step is to estimate $|N(s,t) - N(s,0)|$. However, the barrier argument does not seem to work for this purpose from the equation (3.1) since it is characteristically degenerate along boundary $t = 0$. This is the major obstacle we encounter. We have to employ different methods in the next two sections.

5. Hölder Estimates near Boundary

In this section, we derive the boundary Hölder estimates of N in the geodesic coordinates. The main technique is the de Giorgi iteration.

We first prove some basic results concerning weighted Sobolev spaces. For a domain $G \subset \mathbb{R}^2_+ = \{(s,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t > 0\}$, denote by $\widetilde{W}^{1,2}(G)$ the completion of $C^1(\bar{G})$ under the norm

$$\left(\int_G (tu_t^2 + u_s^2 + u^2)dtds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For any $p_0 = (s_0, 0)$ and any $R > 0$, set

$$G_R(p_0) = \{(s,t) : |s - s_0| < \sqrt{R},\ 0 < t < R\}.$$

If no confusion occurs, we simply write G_R.

Lemma 5.1. (1) *For any $u \in \widetilde{W}^{1,2}(G)$ with $u = 0$ on $\partial G \cap \mathbb{R}^2_+$,*

$$\left(\int_G u^6 dsdt\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \le C \int_G (tu_t^2 + u_s^2) dsdt, \tag{5.1}$$

where C is a universal positive constant, independent of G.

(2) *For any $\epsilon > 0$ and any $u \in C^1(\bar{G}_1)$ with $|\{(s,t) \in G_1 : u(s,t) = 0\}| \ge \epsilon$,*

$$\int_{G_1} u^2 dsdt \le C_\epsilon \int_{G_1} (tu_t^2 + u_s^2) dsdt, \tag{5.2}$$

where C_ϵ is a positive constant depending only on ϵ.

The proof is based on the raising dimension argument.

Proof. Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^2_+$ and $u \in \widetilde{W}^{1,2}(G)$. Define a transform $T : G \to T(G)$ by

$$T(s,t) = (s,\tau) \equiv (s, 2\sqrt{t}).$$

Lift $T(G)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ by defining

$$\widetilde{T(G)} = \{(s,\tau,\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : (s,\tau) \in T(G),\ 0 < \lambda < \tau\}.$$

Then

$$\int_G |u|^p dsdt = \frac{1}{2} \int_{T(G)} |u \circ T^{-1}|^p \tau ds d\tau = \frac{1}{2} ||u \circ T^{-1}||^p_{L^p(\widetilde{T((G))})}, \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$\int_G (tu_t^2 + u_s^2) dsdt = \frac{1}{2} \int_{T(G)} (u_\tau^2 + u_s^2) \tau ds d\tau = \frac{1}{2} \|\widetilde{\nabla}(u \circ T^{-1})\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{T(G)})}, \tag{5.4}$$

where $\widetilde{\nabla} = (\partial_s, \partial_\tau, \partial_\lambda)$ is the gradient in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Now let us consider the first part of the present lemma. It suffices to prove (5.1) for all $u \in C^1(\bar{G})$. Let $u \in C^1(\bar{G})$ with $u = 0$ on $\partial G \cap \mathbb{R}^2_+$. Set

$$\tilde{u}(s,t) = \begin{cases} u(s,t) & \text{for } (s,t) \in G, \\ 0 & \text{for } (s,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+ \setminus G. \end{cases}$$

Then, define $v(s,\tau) = \tilde{u}(s,t)$ and

$$w(s,\tau,\lambda) = \begin{cases} v(s,\tau) & \text{for } (s,\tau,\lambda) \in \widetilde{T(G)}, \\ v(s,\lambda) & \text{for } \lambda > \tau > 0. \end{cases}$$

Then, by the Sobolev extension, we can extend w to $\mathbb{R}^3$ by extensions first with respect to the plane $\tau = 0$ and then to the plane $\lambda = 0$. By the Sobolev embedding, we have $w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w^6 ds d\tau d\lambda\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\widetilde{\nabla} w|^2 ds d\tau d\lambda.$$

Therefore by (5.3) and (5.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\int_G u^6 ds dt\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w^6 ds d\tau d\lambda\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\widetilde{\nabla} w|^2 ds d\tau d\lambda \\ &\leq C' \int_{\widetilde{T(G)}} |\widetilde{\nabla} w|^2 ds d\tau d\lambda = 2C' \int_G (t u_t^2 + u_s^2) ds dt,\end{aligned}$$

where C and C' are universal positive constants, independent of u.

Next, we consider the second part of the present lemma. Suppose that $u \in C^1(\bar{G}_1)$ with $|\{(s,t) \in G_1 : u(s,t) = 0\}| \geq \epsilon > 0$. Then,

$$|\{(s,\tau) : v(s,\tau) = 0\}| \geq C\epsilon,$$

and

$$|\{(s,\tau,\lambda) \in \widetilde{T(G_1)} : w(s,\tau,\lambda) = 0\}| \geq C\epsilon,$$

for some universal constant C. We now extend $\widetilde{T(G_1)}$ by reflecting $\widetilde{T(G_1)}$ with respect to $\lambda = \tau$ to get a domain $\widehat{T(G_1)}$. By the well-known Poincaré inequality, we get

$$\int_{\widehat{T(G_1)}} w^2 ds d\tau d\lambda \leq C_\epsilon \int_{\widehat{T(G_1)}} |\nabla w|^2 ds d\tau d\lambda,$$

where C_ϵ is a positive constant depending only on ϵ. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{G_1} u^2 ds dt = \int_{\widehat{T(G_1)}} w^2 ds d\tau d\lambda &\leq C_\epsilon \int_{\widehat{T(G_1)}} |\widetilde{\nabla} w|^2 ds d\tau d\lambda \\ &\leq C_\epsilon \int_{G_1} (t u_t^2 + u_s^2) ds dt.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the present lemma. □

Next, we discuss the boundary regularity of N. We will first formulate several results for a general class of elliptic equations which are degenerate on boundary. Consider

$$\partial_i(a_{ij}\partial_j u) + b_i \partial_i u = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2_+, \tag{5.5}$$

where we write $(\partial_1, \partial_2) = (\partial_s, \partial_t)$. We first assume, for some positive constant $C_* > 0$,

$$C_*^{-1}(\xi_1^2 + t\xi_2^2) \leq a_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \leq C_*(\xi_1^2 + t\xi_2^2) \quad \text{for any } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{5.6}$$

We then have $C_*^{-1} \leq a_{11} \leq C_*$ by taking $\xi_2 = 0$ and $C_*^{-1} t \leq a_{22} \leq C_* t$ by taking $\xi_1 = 0$. Then $a_{12}^2 \leq a_{11}a_{22} \leq C_*^2 t$. In particular, we have $a_{2j} = 0$ on $t = 0$. Concerning b_1 and b_2, we assume $b_2 = b_{21} + b_{22}$ such that

$$b_{21} \geq 0 \quad \text{on } t = 0, \tag{5.7}$$

and

$$|b_1| + |b_{21}| + |\partial_t b_{21}| \le C_*, \quad |b_{22}| \le C_*\sqrt{t}. \tag{5.8}$$

We first derive an energy estimate for (5.5).

Lemma 5.2. *Let* (5.6), (5.7) *and* (5.8) *be assumed and* $u \in \widetilde{W}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^2_+) \cap C^1(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$ *satisfy* (5.5). *Then, for any* $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$,

$$\int \varphi^2 \left(tu_t^2 + u_s^2\right) \le C \int (\varphi^2 + t\varphi_t^2 + \varphi_s^2 + \varphi|\varphi_t|)u^2 + \int \varphi^2 f^2, \tag{5.9}$$

where C *is a positive constant depending only on* C_* *in* (5.6) *and* (5.8).

Here we emphasize that φ is not assumed to be zero on $\{t = 0\}$.

Proof. We multiply (5.5) by $-\varphi^2 u$ and integrate by parts. Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^2_+$ be a domain such that $\varphi = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2_+ \setminus G$. Then,

$$\int_G \varphi^2 a_{ij} u_i u_j = \int_{\partial G} \varphi^2 u a_{ij} u_j \nu_i - 2\int_G \varphi u a_{ij}\varphi_i u_j + \int_G \varphi^2 u b_i u_i - \int_G \varphi^2 u f.$$

For the boundary integral, we first note $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial G \cap \mathbb{R}^2_+$. Next, on $\partial G \cap \{t = 0\}$, $\nu_1 = 0$ and $a_{2j} = 0$. Hence, boundary integrals are absent from the expression above. Next, the Cauchy inequality implies, for $\varepsilon > 0$ to be determined,

$$2\varphi u a_{ij}\varphi_i u_j \le \varepsilon\varphi^2 a_{ij} u_i u_j + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} a_{ij}\varphi_i\varphi_j u^2.$$

By (5.6), we have

$$a_{ij} u_i u_j \ge C_*^{-1}(u_s^2 + tu_t^2),$$

and

$$a_{ij}\varphi_i\varphi_j \le C_*(\varphi_s^2 + t\varphi_t^2).$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{C_*}(1-\varepsilon)\int \varphi^2(u_s^2 + tu_t^2) \le \frac{C_*}{\varepsilon}\int (\varphi_s^2 + t\varphi_t^2)u^2 + \int \varphi^2 u b_i u_i - \int \varphi^2 u f.$$

Next, for the b_1-term, we have, by $|b_1| \le C_*$ in (5.8),

$$\left|\int \varphi^2 u b_1 u_s\right| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{C_*}\int \varphi^2 u_s^2 + \frac{C_*^3}{\varepsilon}\int \varphi^2 u^2.$$

For the b_2-term, we write $b_2 = b_{21} + b_{22}$ and have, by $|b_{22}| \le C_*\sqrt{t}$ in (5.8),

$$\left|\int \varphi^2 u b_{22} u_t\right| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{C_*}\int \varphi^2 t u_t^2 + \frac{C_*^3}{\varepsilon}\int \varphi^2 u^2.$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_G \varphi^2 b_{21} u u_t = \frac{1}{2}\int_G \varphi^2 b_{21}(u^2)_t = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial G} \varphi^2 b_{21} u^2 \nu_t - \frac{1}{2}\int_G (\varphi^2 b_{21})_t u^2.$$

On $t = 0$, $\nu_2 = -1$ and $b_{21} \ge 0$, and hence

$$\int_{\partial G} \varphi^2 b_{21} u^2 \nu_t \le 0.$$

Therefore, by $|b_{21}| + |\partial_t b_{21}| \le C_*$ in (5.8),

$$\int \varphi^2 b_{21} u u_t \le -\frac{1}{2}\int (\varphi^2 \partial_t b_{21} + 2\varphi\varphi_t b_{21})u^2 \le C_* \int (\varphi^2 + \varphi|\varphi_t|)u^2.$$

By a simple substitution and taking $\varepsilon = 1/4$, we obtain

$$\int \varphi^2 (u_s^2 + t u_t^2) \le C_1 \int (\varphi_s^2 + t\varphi_t^2 + \varphi^2 + \varphi|\varphi_t|)u^2 + C_2 \int \varphi^2 |uf|.$$

Another application of the Cauchy inequality implies the desired result. □

In the following, we study estimates of Hölder norms of solutions near boundary. Our main tool is an iteration due to de Giorgi. We will follow [14] closely.

First, we prove a local L^∞-estimate for subsolutions.

Lemma 5.3. *Let* (5.6), (5.7) *and* (5.8) *be assumed and* $f \in L^q(G_R)$, *for some* $R \in (0,1]$ *and* $q > 3/2$. *Suppose* $u \in C^1(\bar{G}_R)$ *satisfies*

$$\partial_i(a_{ij}u_j) + b_i u_i \ge f \quad \text{weakly in } G_R.$$

Then, for any $\theta \in (0,1)$,

$$\sup_{G_{\theta R}} u^+ \le C\left\{\left(\frac{1}{|G_R|}\int_{G_R} u^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + R\left(\frac{1}{|G_R|}\int_{G_R} |f|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\right\}, \tag{5.10}$$

where C *is a positive constant depending only on* q, θ *and* C_*.

Proof. For simplicity, we assume $R = 1$. Let φ be a smooth cutoff function with support in $G_R \cup \{(s,0) : |s| < 1\})$ and $0 \le \varphi \le 1$, and set $\bar{u} = (u-k)^+$ for some $k \ge 0$. Multiply the differential inequality by $-\varphi^2\bar{u}$ and integrate in G_1. Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\int \varphi^2(\bar{u}_s^2 + t\bar{u}_t^2) \le C\int \big(\varphi^2 + \varphi_s^2 + t\varphi_t^2 + \varphi|\varphi_t|\big)\bar{u}^2 + \int \varphi^2 \bar{u} f,$$

and then

$$\int \big((\partial_s(\varphi\bar{u}))^2 + t(\partial_t(\varphi\bar{u}))^2\big) \le C\int \big(\varphi^2 + \varphi_s^2 + t\varphi_t^2 + \varphi|\varphi_t|\big)\bar{u}^2 + \int \varphi^2\bar{u}f.$$

Lemma 5.1(1) implies

$$\left(\int \varphi^6 \bar{u}^6\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \le C\int \big(\varphi^2 + \varphi_s^2 + t\varphi_t^2 + \varphi|\varphi_t|\big)\bar{u}^2 + \int \varphi^2\bar{u}f.$$

By the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int \varphi^2\bar{u}f &\le \left(\int (\varphi\bar{u})^6\right)^{\frac{1}{6}}\left(\int (\varphi f)^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} |\{\varphi\bar{u} \ne 0\}|^{1-\frac{1}{6}-\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\left(\int \varphi^6\bar{u}^6\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} + \frac{1}{2}\|f\|_{L^q}^2 |\{\varphi\bar{u} \ne 0\}|^{\frac{5}{3}-\frac{2}{q}},\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\left(\int \varphi^6 \bar{u}^6\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \le C \int \left(\varphi^2 + \varphi_s^2 + t\varphi_t^2 + \varphi|\varphi_t|\right)\bar{u}^2 + \|f\|_{L^q}^2 |\{\varphi\bar{u} \neq 0\}|^{\frac{5}{3}-\frac{2}{q}}.$$

By the Hölder inequality again, we have

$$\int (\varphi\bar{u})^2 \le \left(\int \varphi^6 \bar{u}^6\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} |\{\varphi\bar{u} \neq 0\}|^{\frac{2}{3}},$$

and hence

$$\int \varphi^2 \bar{u}^2 \le C \int \left(\varphi^2 + \varphi_s^2 + t\varphi_t^2 + \varphi|\varphi_t|\right)\bar{u}^2 |\{\varphi\bar{u} \neq 0\}|^{\frac{2}{3}} + \|f\|_{L^q}^2 |\{\varphi\bar{u} \neq 0\}|^{\frac{7}{3}-\frac{2}{q}}.$$

In the following, we take

$$\varepsilon = \min\left\{\frac{2}{3}, \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2}{q}\right\}.$$

Then,

$$\int \varphi^2 \bar{u}^2 \le C \int \left(\varphi^2 + \varphi_s^2 + t\varphi_t^2 + \varphi|\varphi_t|\right)\bar{u}^2 |\{\varphi\bar{u} \neq 0\}|^{\varepsilon} + \|f\|_{L^q}^2 |\{\varphi\bar{u} \neq 0\}|^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

Set, for any $r \in (0,1]$ and $k \ge 0$,

$$A(k,r) = \{(s,t) \in G_r : u(s,t) \ge k\}.$$

For any $0 < r < R < 1$, we take a cutoff function φ such that $\varphi = 1$ in G_r and $\varphi = 0$ in $G_1 \setminus G_R$. Then,

$$\varphi^2 + \varphi_s^2 + t\varphi_t^2 + \varphi|\varphi_t| \le \frac{C}{(R-r)^2},$$

and hence

$$\int_{A(k,r)} (u-k)^2 \le C \left\{ \frac{1}{(R-r)^2} \int_{A(k,R)} (u-k)^2 |A(k,R)|^{\varepsilon} + \|f\|_{L^q}^2 |A(k,R)|^{1+\varepsilon} \right\}.$$

For any $h > k \ge 0$, we have

$$\int_{A(h,R)} (u-h)^2 \le \int_{A(k,R)} (u-k)^2,$$

and

$$|A(h,R)| = |G_R \cap \{u - k > h - k\}| \le \frac{1}{(h-k)^2} \int_{A(k,R)} (u-k)^2.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{A(h,r)} (u-h)^2 &\le C \left\{ \frac{1}{(R-r)^2} \int_{A(h,R)} (u-h)^2 + \|f\|_{L^q}^2 |A(h,R)| \right\} |A(h,R)|^{\varepsilon} \\ &\le C \left\{ \frac{1}{(R-r)^2} + \frac{1}{(h-k)^2} \|f\|_{L^q}^2 \right\} \frac{1}{(h-k)^{2\varepsilon}} \left(\int_{A(k,R)} (u-k)^2 \right)^{1+\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

In summary, we obtain, for any $0 < r < R < 1$ and $0 \le k < h$,

$$\|(u-h)^+\|_{L^2(G_r)} \le C\left\{\frac{1}{R-r} + \frac{1}{h-k}\|f\|_{L^q(G_1)}\right\}\frac{1}{(h-k)^\varepsilon}\|(u-k)^+\|^{1+\varepsilon}_{L^2(G_R)}.$$

For any $\theta \in (0,1)$, a standard iteration yields

$$\sup_{G_\theta} u^+ \le C\left\{\|u^+\|_{L^2(G_1)} + \|f\|_{L^q(G_1)}\right\}.$$

This is the desired result. □

Next, we prove a lower bound for positive supersolutions.

Lemma 5.4. *Let* (5.6), (5.7) *and* (5.8) *be assumed and* $f \in L^q(G_1)$, *for some* $q > 3/2$. *Suppose* $u \in C^1(\bar{G}_1)$ *is positive and satisfies*

$$\partial_i(a_{ij}u_j) + b_i u_i \le f \quad \text{weakly in } G_1.$$

Then, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, *there exist constants* $\delta > 0$ *and* $C > 1$, *depending only on* q, ε *and* C_* *in* (5.6) *and* (5.8), *such that, if*

$$|\{(x,t) \in G_1 : u(s,t) \ge \frac{1}{2}\}| \ge \varepsilon|G_1|,$$

and

$$\|f\|_{L^q(G_1)} \le \delta,$$

then,

$$\inf_{G_{1/2}} u \ge \frac{1}{C}. \tag{5.11}$$

Proof. Let φ be a nonnegative smooth cutoff function with support in $G_1 \cup \{(s,0) : |s| < 1\}$. Then,

$$\int a_{ij}u_i\varphi_j - \int b_i u_i\varphi \ge -\int f\varphi. \tag{5.12}$$

If f is not identically zero, we take $\delta = \|f\|_{L^q(B_1)}$. Otherwise, we take an arbitrary $\delta > 0$. Now by replacing φ by $\varphi/(u+\delta)$ in (5.12), we have

$$-\int a_{ij}\frac{u_iu_j}{(u+\delta)^2}\varphi + \int a_{ij}\frac{u_i}{u+\delta}\varphi_j - \int b_i\frac{u_i}{u+\delta}\varphi \ge -\int \frac{f}{u+\delta}\varphi.$$

Then setting

$$v = \log\frac{1}{u+\delta},$$

we get

$$-\int a_{ij}v_iv_j\varphi - \int a_{ij}v_i\varphi_j + \int b_iv_i\varphi \ge -\int \frac{f}{u+\delta}\varphi.$$

In particular, v satisfies

$$\int a_{ij}v_i\varphi_j - \int b_iv_i\varphi \le \int \frac{f}{u+\delta}\varphi.$$

The choice of δ implies $\|f/\delta\|_{L^q(G_1)} \le 1$. Then, for any $\theta \in (1/2, 1)$, Lemma 5.3 implies

$$\sup_{G_{1/2}} (v^+)^2 \le C \left\{ \int_{G_\theta} (v^+)^2 + 1 \right\}, \tag{5.13}$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on q, θ and C_* in (5.6) and (5.8).

Now, replace φ in (5.12) by

$$\left(\frac{1}{u+\delta} - 1 \right)^+ \varphi^2.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int a_{ij} \partial_i v^+ \partial_j v^+ \varphi^2 \le -2 \int \varphi (1-u-\delta)^+ a_{ij} \partial_i v^+ \varphi_j \\ + \int \varphi^2 (1-u-\delta)^+ b_i \partial_i v^+ + \int \varphi^2 \frac{f}{u+\delta} (1-u-\delta)^+. \end{aligned}$$

By writing $b_2 = b_{21} + b_{22}$, we now consider the b_{21}-term and write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{G_1} \varphi^2 (1-u-\delta)^+ b_{21} \partial_t v^+ &= \int_{G_1} \varphi^2 b_{21} \partial_t \left[\left(\log \frac{1}{u+\delta} \right)^+ - (1-u-\delta)^+ \right] \\ &= - \int_{G_1} \partial_t (\varphi^2 b_{21}) \left[\left(\log \frac{1}{u+\delta} \right)^+ - (1-u-\delta)^+ \right] \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial G_1} \varphi^2 b_{21} \left[\left(\log \frac{1}{u+\delta} \right)^+ - (1-u-\delta)^+ \right] \nu_t. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial G_1 \setminus \{t = 0\}$ and $\nu_t = -1$ and $b_{21} \ge 0$ on $\{t = 0\}$. Also, for $u + \delta < 1$,

$$\left(\log \frac{1}{u+\delta} \right)^+ > (1-u-\delta)^+. \tag{5.14}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{G_1} \varphi^2 (1-u-\delta)^+ b_{21} \partial_t v^+ \le \int_{G_1} |\partial_t (\varphi^2 b_{21})| \left(\log \frac{1}{u+\delta} \right)^+,$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int a_{ij} \partial_i v^+ \partial_j v^+ \varphi^2 \le -2 \int \varphi (1-u-\delta)^+ a_{ij} \partial_i v^+ \varphi_j \\ + \int \varphi^2 (1-u-\delta)^+ (b_1 \partial_s v^+ + b_{22} \partial_t v^+) \\ + \int |\partial_t (\varphi^2 b_{21})| v^+ + \int \varphi^2 \frac{f}{u+\delta} (1-u-\delta)^+. \end{aligned}$$

By proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\int \varphi^2 \big(t(\partial_t v^+)^2 + (\partial_s v^+)^2 \big) \le C \left\{ \int (t\varphi_t^2 + \varphi_s^2 + \varphi^2) + \int (\varphi + |\varphi_t|) \varphi v^+ + \int \varphi^2 \frac{f}{\delta} \right\}.$$

The choice of δ implies $\|f/\delta\|_{L^q(G_1)} \le 1$. Hence, for any $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < 1$, we take $\varphi = 1$ in G_{θ_1} and $\varphi = 0$ in $G_1 \setminus G_{\theta_2}$. Then, for any $\tau \in (0,1)$ to be determined, we have

$$\int_{G_{\theta_1}} \left(t(\partial_t v^+)^2 + (\partial_s v^+)^2\right) \le \frac{C_\tau}{(\theta_2-\theta_1)^2} + \tau \int_{G_{\theta_2}} (v^+)^2. \tag{5.15}$$

Note

$$\begin{aligned} &|\{(s,t) \in G_{\theta_1} : v^+ = 0\}| \\ \ge &|\{(s,t) \in G_1 : u + \delta \ge 1\}| - |G_1| + |G_{\theta_1}| \\ \ge &|G_{\theta_1}| - (1-\varepsilon)|G_1| = \left(1 - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\theta_1^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right)|G_{\theta_1}| \ge \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon |G_{\theta_1}|, \end{aligned}$$

by taking θ_1 such that

$$\theta_0 \equiv \max\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}\right\} < \theta_1 < 1.$$

Then Lemma 5.1(2) implies

$$\int_{G_{\theta_1}} (v^+)^2 \le C \int_{G_{\theta_1}} \left(t(v_t^+)^2 + (v_s^+)^2\right) \text{ for all } \theta_1 \ge \theta_0. \tag{5.16}$$

It must be emphasized that C in (5.16) depends on ε through θ_0, and is independent of θ_1. By combining (5.15) and (5.16), we have

$$\int_{G_{\theta_1}} (v^+)^2 \le \frac{C_\tau}{(\theta_2-\theta_1)^2} + C\tau \int_{G_{\theta_2}} (v^+)^2.$$

Now choose τ such that $C\tau = 1/2$. We obtain, for any $\theta_0 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 < 1$,

$$\int_{G_{\theta_1}} (v^+)^2 \le \frac{C_\tau}{(\theta_2-\theta_1)^2} + \frac{1}{2}\int_{G_{\theta_2}} (v^+)^2.$$

A standard iteration yields, for any $\theta_0 < \theta < 1$,

$$\int_{G_\theta} (v^+)^2 \le \frac{C}{(1-\theta)^2}. \tag{5.17}$$

By combining (5.13) and (5.17) and fixing a $\theta \in (\theta_0, 1)$, we obtain

$$\sup_{G_{1/2}} (v^+)^2 \le C,$$

and hence

$$\inf_{G_{1/2}} u + \delta \ge e^{-C}.$$

We note that the constant C above is independent of δ. If $f \equiv 0$, we simply let $\delta \to 0$. Otherwise, by taking $\delta = e^{-C}/2$, we have the desired estimate. □

Now, we are ready to prove an estimate of boundary Hölder norms.

Theorem 5.5. *Let* (5.6), (5.7) *and* (5.8) *be assumed and* $f \in L^q(G_1)$, *for some* $q > 3/2$. *Suppose* $u \in C^1(\bar{G}_1)$ *satisfies*

$$\partial_i(a_{ij}u_j) + b_i u_i = f \quad \text{in } G_1.$$

Then, for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$,

$$|u(s,t) - u(s,0)| \le C\left(\sup_{G_1}|u| + \|f\|_{L^q(G_1)}\right)t^\alpha \quad \text{for any } (s,t) \in G_{1/2}, \tag{5.18}$$

where α *and* C *are positive constants depending only on* q *and* C_* *in* (5.6) *and* (5.8).

Proof. Set, for any $r \le 1$,

$$M(r) = \sup_{G_r} u, \quad m(r) = \inf_{G_r} u,$$

and

$$\omega(r) = M(r) - m(r).$$

We now claim, for any $r \le 1$,

$$\omega\left(\frac{r}{2}\right) \le \gamma\omega(r) + Cr^{1-\frac{3}{2q}}\|f\|_{L^q(G_r)}, \tag{5.19}$$

where $\gamma \in (0,1)$ and $C > 1$ are constants depending only on q and C_* in (5.6) and (5.8). By a simple iteration, we have, for any $r \le 1/2$,

$$\omega(r) \le Cr^\alpha\left\{\omega(1) + \|f\|_{L^q(G_1)}\right\},$$

where $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $C > 1$ are constants depending only on q and C_* in (5.6) and (5.8).

We now prove (5.19) for $r = 1$. The general case follows from a simple scaling. Let $\varepsilon = 1/2$ and δ be determined as in Lemma 5.4. If

$$\delta\omega(1) \le \|f\|_{L^q(G_1)},$$

then,

$$\omega\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \le \omega(1) \le \frac{1}{\delta}\|f\|_{L^q(G_1)}. \tag{5.20}$$

Next, we assume

$$\|f\|_{L^q(G_1)} \le \delta\omega(1).$$

We note that $u/\omega(1)$ satisfies

$$\partial_i\left(a_{ij}\partial_j\left(\frac{u}{\omega(1)}\right)\right) + b_i\partial_i\left(\frac{u}{\omega(1)}\right) = \frac{f}{\omega(1)} \quad \text{in } G_1.$$

Hence

$$\left\|\frac{f}{\omega(1)}\right\|_{L^q(G_1)} \le \delta$$

by the previous assumption. We consider the following two cases:

$$|\{(s,t) \in G_1 : \frac{u - m(1)}{M(1) - m(1)} \ge \frac{1}{2}\}| \ge \frac{1}{2}|G_1|, \tag{5.21}$$

and

$$|\{(s,t) \in G_1 : \frac{M(1)-u}{M(1)-m(1)} \geq \frac{1}{2}\}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|G_1|. \tag{5.22}$$

If (5.21) holds, we apply Lemma 5.4 to $(u-m(1))/(M(1)-m(1))$ and get

$$m\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - m(1) \geq \frac{1}{C}(M(1)-m(1)).$$

If (5.22) holds, we apply Lemma 5.4 to $(M(1)-u)/(M(1)-m(1))$ and get

$$M(1) - M\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \geq \frac{1}{C}(M(1)-m(1)).$$

Since $m(1/2) \geq m(1)$ and $M(1/2) \leq M(1)$, we have in both cases

$$M\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - m\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \leq \left(1-\frac{1}{C}\right)(M(1)-m(1)),$$

and hence

$$\omega\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \leq \gamma\omega(1), \tag{5.23}$$

for some constant $\gamma \in (0,1)$. We have (5.19) by combining (5.20) and (5.23). □

Now, we prove two estimates of N. The first concerns an energy estimate of N and the second concerns a boundary Hölder estimate of N.

Theorem 5.6. *Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^5 and σ be a connected component of $\partial\Sigma$. Then, in the geodesic coordinates as in (2.1) and (2.2),*

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{2\pi} \left(tN_t^2 + N_s^2\right) dsdt \leq C, \tag{5.24}$$

and

$$|N(s,t) - N(s,0)| \leq Ct^\alpha \quad \text{for any } t \leq 1, \tag{5.25}$$

where $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $C > 0$ are constants depending only on the quantities in (4.1).

Proof. Set

$$u = \frac{1}{N^2}.$$

By (3.3) and with slightly different notations, u satisfies

$$\partial_i(a^{ij}\partial_j u) + b^i\partial_i u = f,$$

where

$$a^{11} = N^2, \quad a^{12} = -MN, \quad a^{22} = LN,$$
$$b^2 = 2B^2K_t + 3BB_tK - \frac{5B_t}{B}M^2 + \frac{B_s}{B}MN,$$

and b^1 and f are bounded by Lemma 4.1. We now verify (5.6), (5.7) and (5.8).

By Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\frac{1}{C} \le N \le C, \quad |M| \le C\sqrt{t}, \quad L \le Ct.$$

Then, $b^2 = 2B^2K_t + \tilde{b}^2 t$, where $\tilde{b}^2$ is a bounded function, and hence (5.7) and (5.8) hold. Moreover,

$$N^2\xi_1^2 - 2MN\xi_1\xi_2 + LN\xi_2^2 \le C(\xi_1^2 + t\xi_2^2).$$

Next, by $LN = M^2 + KB^2$, we have

$$N^2\xi_1^2 - 2MN\xi_1\xi_2 + LN\xi_2^2 = (N\xi_1 - M\xi_2)^2 + KB^2\xi_2^2,$$

and hence, by choosing c small,

$$\begin{aligned} cN^2(\xi_1^2 + t\xi_2^2) &\le 2c(N\xi_1 - M\xi_2)^2 + 2cM^2\xi_2^2 + cN^2t\xi_2^2 \\ &= 2c(N\xi_1 - M\xi_2)^2 + \left(2cM^2 + cN^2t\right)\xi_2^2 \\ &\le (N\xi_1 - M\xi_2)^2 + KB^2\xi_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (5.6) is satisfied. By Lemma 5.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{2\pi} \left(t\left(\partial_t(N^{-2})\right)^2 + \left(\partial_s(N^{-2})\right)^2\right) dsdt \\ &\qquad \le C\int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (N^{-4} + f^2) dsdt \le C. \end{aligned}$$

We point out that u is periodic in s. Hence, we can take φ as a cutoff function of t near $t = 1$. We then have the desired result by the boundedness of N.

By Theorem 5.5, we obtain, for any $0 < t \le 1/2$,

$$\left|\frac{1}{N(s,t)^2} - \frac{1}{N(s,0)^2}\right| \le Ct^\alpha \left(\sup_{t\in(0,1)} \left|\frac{1}{N^2}\right| + \sup_{t\in(0,1)} |f|\right) \le C_1 t^\alpha,$$

and hence

$$|N(s,t) - N(s,0)| = \left|\frac{1}{N(s,t)^2} - \frac{1}{N(s,0)^2}\right| \frac{N(s,t)^2N(s,0)^2}{N(s,t) + N(s,0)} \le C_1 t^\alpha.$$

As for $t \in [1/2, 1]$, (5.25) follows immediately from the boundedness of N. We thus have the desired result. □

6. Lipschitz Estimates near Boundary

In this section, we derive the Lipschitz norms of the second fundamental form near boundary. Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 5.6 are not enough for $C^{2,\alpha}$-estimates. We need a result stronger than Theorem 5.6 for $N(s,t) - N(s,0)$ and a result stronger than Lemma 4.2 for $M(s,t)$. We will employ blowup techniques in this section.

In the proof of the next result, we will use Theorem 8.4 to conclude the smoothness of solutions to a limit equation.

Theorem 6.1. *Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^5 and σ be a connected component of $\partial\Sigma$. Then, in the geodesic coordinates as in (2.1) and (2.2),*

$$|N(s,t) - N(s,0)| \le Ct \quad \text{for any } t \le 1, \tag{6.1}$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on the quantities in (4.1).

Proof. Set

$$u = \frac{1}{N^2} - \frac{1}{N^2(s,0)}.$$

By (3.11), (3.12) and (3.13), and with slightly different notations, u satisfies

$$\partial_i(a^{ij}\partial_j u) + b^i\partial_i u = f,$$

where

$$a^{11} = N^2, \quad a^{12} = -MN, \quad a^{22} = LN,$$
$$b^2 = 2B^2K_t + 3BB_tK - \frac{5B_t}{B}M^2 + \frac{B_s}{B}MN + \frac{1}{2}MN^3\partial_s\left(\frac{1}{N^2(s,0)}\right),$$

and b^1 and f are bounded.

We now prove (6.1) by contradiction. If it was false, then there would exist a sequence of Alexandrov-Nirenberg surfaces Σ_k, with their induced metrics g_k in $\bar{D}$, such that, in the geodesic coordinates as in (2.1) and (2.2),

$$|g_k|_{C^4}, (\inf \partial_t K_k(s,0))^{-1} \text{ and } (\inf \partial_t B_k(s,0))^{-1} \text{ are uniformly bounded,}$$

and

$$\theta_k \equiv \sup\left\{\frac{|N_k(s,t) - N_k(s,0)|}{t}\right\} \to \infty \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \tag{6.2}$$

Set $\Omega_1 = \{(s,t) : s \in [0,2\pi],\, t \in (0,1)\}$. We also assume $g_k \to g$ in $C^3(\bar{\Omega}_1)$ for some smooth metrics g on $\bar{\Omega}_1$. Let (s_k,t_k) be a point such that $t_k > 0$ and

$$\frac{|N_k(s_k,t_k) - N_k(s_k,0)|}{t_k} \ge \frac{1}{2}\theta_k.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $(s_k,t_k) \to (0,0)$. By Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, we have, for any $k \ge 1$,

$$\frac{1}{C} \le N_k \le C, \quad |M_k| \le C\sqrt{t},$$

and hence

$$t_k\theta_k \le C,$$

where C is a positive constant under control. Furthermore, Theorem 5.6 implies

$$|N_k(s,t) - N_k(s,0)| \le Ct^\alpha, \tag{6.3}$$

where $\alpha \in (0,1)$ is a constant under control.

Set

$$u_k(s,t) = \frac{1}{N_k^2(s,t)} - \frac{1}{N_k^2(s,0)}.$$

Then,

$$\partial_i(a_k^{ij}\partial_j u_k) + b_k^i \partial_i u_k = f_k, \tag{6.4}$$

where a_k^{ij}, b_k^i and f_k are uniformly bounded, independent of k. Consider the transform

$$x = \frac{s - s_k}{\sqrt{t_k}}, \quad y = \frac{t}{t_k}, \tag{6.5}$$

and set

$$w_k(x,y) = u_k(s,t), \quad \bar{w}_k(x,y) = \frac{1}{\theta_k t_k} w_k(x,y).$$

Then,

$$|\bar{w}_k| \le Cy, \quad |\bar{w}_k(0,1)| \ge \frac{1}{C}, \tag{6.6}$$

for some constant C under control. In the new coordinates (x,y), w_k and $\bar{w}_k$ satisfy, with $(\partial_1, \partial_2) = (\partial_x, \partial_y)$,

$$\partial_i(\widetilde{a}_k^{ij}\partial_j w_k) + \widetilde{b}_k^i \partial_i w_k = t_k f_k, \tag{6.7}$$

and

$$\partial_i(\widetilde{a}_k^{ij}\partial_j \bar{w}_k) + \widetilde{b}_k^i \partial_i \bar{w}_k = \theta_k^{-1} f_k, \tag{6.8}$$

where

$$\widetilde{a}_k^{11} = a_k^{11}, \quad \widetilde{a}_k^{12} = \frac{a_k^{12}}{\sqrt{t_k}}, \quad \widetilde{a}_k^{22} = \frac{a_k^{22}}{t_k},$$

and

$$\widetilde{b}_k^1 = \sqrt{t_k} b_k^1, \quad \widetilde{b}_k^2 = b_k^2.$$

In particular,

$$\widetilde{a}_k^{11} = N_k^2, \quad \widetilde{a}_k^{12} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{t_k}} M_k N_k, \quad \widetilde{a}_k^{22} = \frac{1}{t_k} L_k N_k.$$

Hence,

$$C^{-1}(\xi_1^2 + y\xi_2^2) \le \widetilde{a}_k^{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \le C(\xi_1^2 + y\xi_2^2) \quad \text{for any } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

for some constant C under control. Therefore, the principle part of (6.8) is an elliptic equation of divergence form with bounded measurable coefficients in the region $\{y > \delta\}$. Then, for any $\delta, R > 0$, there is a positive $\beta \in (0,1)$, depending only on δ and R, such that

$$|\bar{w}_k|_{C^\beta(B_R \cap \{y > \delta\})} \le C_{R\delta}. \tag{6.9}$$

Next, let ψ be a cut-off function in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then we claim

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} \psi^2 \left(y(\partial_y \bar{w}_k)^2 + (\partial_x \bar{w}_k)^2 \right) \le C_\psi, \tag{6.10}$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} \psi^2 \left(y(\partial_y w_k)^2 + (\partial_x w_k)^2 \right) \le C_\psi t_k^{2\alpha}, \tag{6.11}$$

where α is the constant as in Theorem 5.6 and C_ψ is a positive constant depending only on ψ and other quantities under control. To see this, we first note by Lemma 5.2

$$\begin{aligned}&\int \psi^2 \left(y(\partial_y \bar{w}_k)^2 + (\partial_x \bar{w}_k)^2\right)\\ &\qquad \le C\int (\psi^2 + y\psi_y^2 + \psi_x^2 + |\psi_y|)\bar{w}_k^2 + C\theta_k^{-2}\int \psi^2 |f_k|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

This implies (6.10) easily by (6.6). Similarly, w_k satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}&\int \psi^2 \left(y(\partial_y w_k)^2 + (\partial_x w_k)^2\right)\\ &\qquad \le C\int (\psi^2 + y\psi_y^2 + \psi_x^2 + |\psi_y|)w_k^2 + Ct_k^2\int \psi^2 |f_k|^2.\end{aligned}$$

By (6.3), we have

$$|w_k(x,y)| \le C|N_k(s,t) - N_k(s,0)| \le Ct^\alpha = Ct_k^\alpha y^\alpha,$$

and hence (6.11) follows.

Next, we claim

$$\int \psi^2 \frac{M_k^2}{t_k} \to 0 \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \tag{6.13}$$

To prove this, we note that (2.4) implies

$$\partial_t M_k + \frac{1}{2}N_k^3 \partial_s \left(\frac{1}{N_k^2} - \frac{1}{N_k^2(0,s)}\right) = -\frac{B_t}{B}M_k - \frac{1}{2}N_k^3\partial_s\left(\frac{1}{N_k^2(0,s)}\right) \equiv h_k,$$

and hence

$$\partial_y M_k + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{t_k}N_k^3 \partial_x w_k = t_k h_k. \tag{6.14}$$

Then,

$$\int \psi^2 (\partial_y M_k)^2 \le Ct_k \int \psi^2 (\partial_x w_k)^2 + Ct_k^2 \int \psi^2 h_k^2.$$

In view of the fact that $M_k(x,0) = 0$, we have, for arbitrary $r, T > 0$ and any $\psi \in C_0^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\psi = 1$ on $[-r, r] \times [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \int_{-r}^r \frac{|M_k|^2}{t_k} dxdy &\le T^2 \int_0^T \int_{-r}^r \frac{|\partial_y M_k|^2}{t_k} dxdy\\ &\le C\int \psi^2 (\partial_x w_k)^2 + Ct_k \int \psi^2 h_k^2 \to 0 \quad \text{as } k \to \infty,\end{aligned}$$

where we used (6.11) in the final step. This finishes the proof of (6.13). In terms of coefficients, we have

$$\int \psi^2 (\widetilde{a}_k^{12})^2 \to 0 \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \tag{6.15}$$

In view of (6.9), we can find a subsequence of $\{\bar{w}_k\}$, still denoted by $\bar{w}_k$, such that,

$$\bar{w}_k \to w \quad \text{locally uniformly in } \mathbb{R}^2_+,$$

for some $w \in C(\mathbb{R}^2_+)$. By (6.6), we have

$$|w(x,y)| \le Cy \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2_+,$$

and

$$|w(0,1)| \ge \frac{1}{C}. \tag{6.16}$$

The former estimate implies $w \in C(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$ and

$$w(x,0) = 0.$$

In the following, we prove that w satisfies

$$yw_{yy} + \frac{N^2(0)}{K_t(0)} w_{xx} + 3w_y = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2_+. \tag{6.17}$$

Indeed, for any cut-off function $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2_+)$, multiplying both sides of (6.8) by ψ and integrating by parts, we have

$$\int \left(\widetilde{a}_k^{ij} \partial_i \bar{w}_k \partial_j \psi - \widetilde{b}_k^i \partial_i \bar{w}_k \psi \right) = - \int \psi \theta_k^{-1} f_k. \tag{6.18}$$

Since f_k and b_k^1 are bounded, we have

$$\int \psi \theta_k^{-1} f_k \to 0,$$

and, by (6.10),

$$\int \psi \widetilde{b}_k^1 \partial_x \bar{w}_k = \sqrt{t_k} \int \psi b_k^1 \partial_x \bar{w}_k \to 0,$$

as $k \to \infty$. Next, since

$$\widetilde{b}_k^2 = b_k^2 = 2\partial_t K_k(s,0) + O(\sqrt{t}) = 2\partial_t K_k(s,0) + \sqrt{t_k} O(\sqrt{y}),$$

then

$$\left| \int \psi \widetilde{b}_k^2 \partial_y \bar{w}_k - 2 \int \partial_t K_k(s,0) \psi \partial_y \bar{w}_k \right| \le C\sqrt{t_k} \int \psi \sqrt{y} |\partial_y \bar{w}_k|,$$

and hence, by (6.10),

$$\int \psi \widetilde{b}_k^2 \partial_y \bar{w}_k \to 2 \int \psi K_t(0) w_y,$$

as $k \to \infty$. By (6.10) and (6.15), we have

$$\int |\psi_y \widetilde{a}_k^{12} \partial_x \bar{w}_k| \le \left(\int |\psi_y| (\widetilde{a}_k^{12})^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int |\psi_y| |\partial_x \bar{w}_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \to 0,$$

as $k \to \infty$. Next, by (6.3) and $\widetilde{a}_k^{11} = N_k^2$, we have

$$\int |\psi_x (\widetilde{a}_k^{11} - \widetilde{a}_k^{11}(0)) \partial_x \bar{w}_k| \le C t_k^\alpha \left(\int |\psi_x| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int |\psi_x| |\partial_x \bar{w}_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \to 0,$$

or

$$\int \psi_x \widetilde{a}_k^{11} \partial_x \bar{w}_k \to \int N^2(0) \psi_x w_x,$$

as $k \to \infty$. We note that $N_k(s,0)$ is intrinsically determined by Lemma 2.1. For the $\widetilde{a}_k^{22}$ term, we note

$$\int \psi_y \widetilde{a}_k^{22} \partial_y \bar{w}_k = \int \psi_y \frac{N_k L_k}{t_k} \partial_y \bar{w}_k = \int \psi_y \frac{M_k^2}{t_k} \partial_y \bar{w}_k + \int \psi_y \frac{K_k B_k^2}{t_k} \partial_y \bar{w}_k.$$

By writing

$$\frac{M_k^2}{t_k} = \frac{M_k}{\sqrt{t_k}} \cdot \frac{M_k}{\sqrt{t_k}} \le C \frac{\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{t_k}} \cdot \frac{|M_k|}{\sqrt{t_k}} \le C\sqrt{y} \frac{|M_k|}{\sqrt{t_k}},$$

we have, by (6.10) and (6.13)

$$\left| \int \psi_y \frac{M_k^2}{t_k} \partial_y \bar{w}_k \right| \le C \left(\int |\psi_y| \frac{M_k^2}{t_k} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int |\psi_y| y |\partial_y \bar{w}_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \to 0,$$

as $k \to \infty$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} K_k(s,t) &= K_k(s_k + \sqrt{t_k}x, t_k y) - K(s_k + \sqrt{t_k}x, 0) \\ &= t_k y \int_0^1 \partial_t K_k(s_k + \sqrt{t_k}x, t_k y\tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{K_k}{t_k} \to y K_t(0) \quad \text{locally uniformly in } \mathbb{R}^2_+,$$

and hence

$$\int \psi_y \widetilde{a}_k^{22} \partial_y \bar{w}_k \to \int \psi_y K_t(0) y w_y,$$

as $k \to \infty$. Finally, by passing to the limit in (6.18), we get

$$\int \left(K_t(0) y \psi_y w_y + N^2(0) \psi_x w_x - 2K_t(0) \psi w_y \right) = 0.$$

This is simply the equation (6.17) in the weak sense after multiplying both sides by $1/K_t(0)$. Therefore, applying Theorem 8.4 to (6.17), we conclude that its solution $w \in C^\infty(\{y \ge 0\})$. Moreover, w is analytic in a neighborhood of 0 as shown in [23]; namely, w can be expanded in terms of a Taylor series in $B_r(0) \cap \{y \ge 0\}$ for some positive constant r. Now by (6.17) and $w = 0$ on $y = 0$, we get $\partial_y^k w = 0$ on $y = 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots$. Therefore, $w \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2_+$, which contradicts (6.16). This ends the proof for the present theorem. □

We now improve the estimate for M in Lemma 4.2.

Theorem 6.2. *Let Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^5 and σ be a connected component of $\partial\Sigma$. Then, in the geodesic coordinates as in (2.1) and (2.2),*

$$|M(s,t)| \le Ct \quad \text{for any } t \le 1, \tag{6.19}$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on the quantities in (4.1).

Proof. By (3.15) and (3.19), and with slightly different notations, M satisfies

$$\partial_i(a^{ij}\partial_j M) + b^i\partial_i M + ca^{ij}\partial_i M\partial_j M = f,$$

where

$$a^{11} = N, \quad a^{12} = -M, \quad a^{22} = L, \quad c = -\frac{2M}{NL},$$

and b_i and f are bounded by Remark 3.4 and Theorem 6.1.

We now prove (6.19) by contradiction. If it was false, then there would exist a sequence of Alexandrov-Nirenberg surfaces Σ_k, with their induced metrics g_k in $\bar{D}$, such that, in the geodesic coordinates as in (2.1) and (2.2),

$$|g_k|_{C^4}, (\inf \partial_t K_k(s,0))^{-1} \text{ and } (\inf \partial_t B_k(s,0))^{-1} \text{ are uniformly bounded,}$$

and

$$\theta_k \equiv \sup\left\{\frac{|M_k(s,t)|}{t}\right\} \to \infty \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \tag{6.20}$$

Set $\Omega_1 = \{(s,t) : s \in [0,2\pi],\, t \in (0,1)\}$. We also assume $g_k \to g$ in $C^3(\bar{\Omega}_1)$ for some smooth metrics g on $\bar{\Omega}_1$. Let (s_k, t_k) be a point such that $t_k > 0$

$$\frac{|M_k(s_k,t_k)|}{t_k} \geq \frac{1}{2}\theta_k.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $(s_k, t_k) \to (0,0)$. By Corollary 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, we have, for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq N_k \leq C, \quad |M_k| \leq C\sqrt{t},$$

and hence

$$\sqrt{t_k}\theta_k \leq C, \tag{6.21}$$

where C is a positive constant under control.

Consider the transform

$$x = \frac{s - s_k}{\sqrt{t_k}}, \quad y = \frac{t}{t_k}, \tag{6.22}$$

and set

$$\bar{M}_k(x,y) = \frac{1}{t_k\theta_k}M_k(s,t),$$

and

$$w_k(x,y) = \frac{1}{N_k^2(s,t)} - \frac{1}{N_k^2(s,0)}, \quad \bar{w}_k(x,y) = \frac{w_k}{\theta_k t_k}.$$

Then,

$$|\bar{M}_k(0,1)| \geq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{6.23}$$

Moreover, by Theorem 6.1,

$$|\bar{w}_k| \leq C\theta_k^{-1}y. \tag{6.24}$$

In the original coordinates (s,t), M_k satisfies

$$\partial_i(a_k^{ij}\partial_j M_k) + b_k^i\partial_i M_k + c_k a_k^{ij}\partial_i M_k\partial_j M_k = f_k,$$

where

$$a_k^{11} = N_k, \quad a_k^{12} = -M_k, \quad a_k^{22} = L_k, \quad c_k = -\frac{2M_k}{N_kL_k},$$

and b^i and f_k are uniformly bounded, independent of k. Then in the new coordinates (x,y), $\bar{M}_k$ satisfies

$$\partial_i(\widetilde{a}_k^{ij}\partial_j \bar{M}_k) + \widetilde{b}_k^i\partial_i \bar{M}_k + \widetilde{c}_k\widetilde{a}_k^{ij}\partial_i \bar{M}_k\partial_j \bar{M}_k = \theta_k^{-1} f_k, \tag{6.25}$$

where

$$\widetilde{a}_k^{11} = a_k^{11}, \quad \widetilde{a}_k^{12} = \frac{a_k^{12}}{\sqrt{t_k}}, \quad \widetilde{a}_k^{22} = \frac{a_k^{22}}{t_k}, \quad \widetilde{c}_k = t_k\theta_k c_k,$$
$$\widetilde{b}_k^1 = \sqrt{t_k}b_k^1, \quad \widetilde{b}_k^2 = b_k^2.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 6.1, we have

$$C^{-1}(\xi_1^2 + y\xi_2^2) \le \widetilde{a}_k^{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \le C(\xi_1^2 + y\xi_2^2) \quad \text{for any } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

for some constant C under control. Moreover, by (6.21),

$$|\tilde{c}_k| = \left|\frac{2t_k\theta_k M_k}{N_kL_k}\right| \le \frac{Ct_k\theta_k|M_k|}{K_k} \le \frac{Ct_k\theta_k}{\sqrt{t}} = \frac{C\sqrt{t_k}\theta_k}{\sqrt{y}} \le \frac{C}{\sqrt{y}}.$$

As $y > \delta$ where $\delta > 0$, the principle part of (6.25) is an elliptic equation of divergence form with bounded measurable coefficients and the nonlinear terms of first derivatives are quadratic. Then, for any $\delta, R > 0$, there is a positive $\beta \in (0,1)$, depending only on δ and R, such that

$$|\bar{M}_k|_{C^\beta(B_R\cap\{y>\delta\})} \le C_{R\delta}. \tag{6.26}$$

This follows from the Hölder estimate due to de Giorgi and Moser. We point out that the Hölder estimate still holds even with the presence of the quadratic nonlinear terms in first derivatives. Then, by (6.23), there exists an $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$|\bar{M}_k| \ge \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{in } B_{r_0}((0,1)). \tag{6.27}$$

Let ψ be a cutoff function in $\mathbb{R}^2$. By (6.12) and (6.24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int \psi^2\left(y(\partial_y\bar{w}_k)^2 + (\partial_x\bar{w}_k)^2\right)\\ &\le C\int(\psi^2 + y\psi_y^2 + \psi_x^2 + |\psi_y|)\bar{w}_k^2 + C\theta_k^{-2}\int\psi^2|f_k|^2 \le C_\psi\frac{1}{\theta_k^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.28}$$

By (6.14), we have

$$\partial_y\bar{M}_k + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{t_k}N_k^3\partial_x\bar{w}_k = \frac{1}{\theta_k}h_k,$$

and hence, by (6.28),

$$\int\psi^2(\partial_y\bar{M}_k)^2 \le Ct_k\int\psi^2(\partial_x\bar{w}_k)^2 + C\frac{1}{\theta_k^2}\int\psi^2h_k^2 \le C_\psi\frac{1}{\theta_k^2} \to 0,$$

as $k \to \infty$. In view of the fact that $\bar{M}_k(x,0) = 0$, we have, for arbitrary $r, T > 0$

$$\int_0^T \int_{-r}^r |\bar{M}_k|^2 dxdy \le T^2 \int_0^T \int_{-r}^r |\partial_y \bar{M}_k|^2 dxdy \to 0,$$

as $k \to \infty$. This contradicts (6.27) and hence completes the proof of the present theorem. □

7. Higher Order Estimates near Boundary

In this section, we derive estimates of higher order derivatives of the second fundamental forms and prove Theorem 1.2. Interior estimates are already proved in Theorem 2.7. Next, we estimate the higher order derivatives of L, M, N in the geodesic coordinates as in (2.1) and (2.2) near the boundary. We need Lemma 8.2 and Lemma 8.3 in the proof of the following result.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $k \ge 2$ be an integer, Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^{k+6}, with the induced metric g in D, and $\mathbf{r}$ be the position vector of Σ. Then, for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$, in the geodesic coordinates based a connected component of ∂D as in (2.1) and (2.2), with $\Omega_t = [0, 2\pi] \times (0, t)$,*

$$|\nabla^k M|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega}_{1/2})}, |\nabla^k N|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega}_{1/2})} \le C\left(\alpha, k, |g|_{C^{k+5}(\bar{\Omega}_1)}, \max_{t=0} \frac{1}{|\nabla K|}, \max_{t=0} \frac{1}{k_g}\right).$$

Proof. Let σ be a connected component of $\partial\Sigma$ and take the geodesic coordinates based on σ as in (2.1) and (2.2). By Lemma 4.1, Theorem 5.6, Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.2, we have

$$\frac{1}{C^*} \le N \le C_*, \tag{7.1}$$

$$|M(s,t)| + |N(s,t) - N(s,0)| \le C_* t \quad \text{for any } t \in [0,1], \tag{7.2}$$

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{2\pi} \left(t(\partial_t N)^2 + (\partial_s N)^2\right) dsdt \le C_*, \tag{7.3}$$

where C_* is a positive constant depending only on the quantities in (4.1). We now prove estimates of higher derivatives near $(s,t) = (0,0)$.

We first rewrite the equation (3.1) for $1/N$. In view of (2.5), it is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned} NL &= t\left(\partial_t K(0) + \frac{M^2}{t} + sc_1 + tc_2\right) = t\bar{a}_{22}, \\ N^2 &= N^2(0) + (N^2 - N^2(0)), \\ A_{12} &= 3K_t(0) + (N^2 - N^2(s,0))c_3 + sc_4 + Mc_5 + tc_6, \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

for some smooth functions c_i, $i = 1, \cdots, 6$, of s, t, M and N. Dividing both sides of (3.1) by $\bar{a}_{22}/N$ reduces it to the equation of $u = 1/N$ in the form

$$\mathcal{L}u = tu_{tt} - ta_{12}u_{st} + a_{11}u_{ss} + b_2 u_t + b_1 u_s = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2_+, \tag{7.5}$$

where

$$a_{12}=\frac{NM}{t\bar{a}_{22}},\quad a_{11}=\frac{N^2}{\bar{a}_{22}},\quad b_1=\frac{A_{11}}{\bar{a}_{22}},$$
$$b_2=3+\frac{1}{\bar{a}_{22}}\big((N-N(s,0))\bar{c}_1+s\bar{c}_2+M\bar{c}_3+t\bar{c}_4\big),$$

for some smooth functions $\bar{c}_i$, $i=1,...,4$, of s,t,M and N. It is easy to see that, for the equation (7.5), all the assumptions in Lemma 8.2 are satisfied by the hypotheses in the present theorem. Therefore, we can conclude that, for some cutoff function φ_r,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\varphi_r N^{-1}\|_{W^{1,6}(\mathbb{R}^2_+)}+\|t\varphi_r N^{-1}\|_{W^{2,6}(\mathbb{R}^2_+)}\\&\quad+\|\varphi_r\partial_s^2 N^{-1}\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2_+)}+\|t^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi_r\partial_{st}N^{-1}\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2_+)}\le C,\end{aligned}$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on the quantities in (4.1). We now record (3.6) in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s M&=-\frac{L}{N}\partial_t N+\frac{2M}{N}\partial_s N-\frac{B_t}{B}L+\frac{B_s}{B}M\\&\quad-BB_tN-\frac{2B_t}{B}\frac{M^2}{N}+\frac{1}{N}(B^2K)_t,\\\partial_t M&=\partial_s N-\frac{B_t}{B}M.\end{aligned}\tag{7.6}$$

Then,

$$\|\varphi_r M\|_{W^{1,6}(\mathbb{R}^2_+)}\le C.$$

By the Sobolev embedding in [18](Lemma B.3), we have, for $\gamma=1-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{2}{6}=\frac{1}{6}$,

$$|\varphi_r N|_{C^\gamma}+|\varphi_r M|_{C^\gamma}+|\varphi_r\partial_s N|_{C^\gamma}+|\varphi_r t\partial_t(N^{-1})|_{C^\gamma}\le C.\tag{7.7}$$

By (7.6), we have $\partial_t M\in C^\gamma$. Then

$$\frac{M^2}{t}=M\int_0^1\partial_2 M(s,\theta t)d\theta\in C^\gamma$$

In view of (7.4), we get

$$|\varphi_r a_{ij}|_{C^\gamma}+|\varphi_r b_i|_{C^\gamma}+|\varphi_r f|_{C^\gamma}\le C,$$

for some smaller r and some constant C under control. Thus all the assumptions in Lemma 8.3 are satisfied if we take $\alpha=\gamma$ and hence,

$$I_\gamma(\varphi_r N^{-1})\le C_1.$$

Then combining with (7.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned}&|\varphi_r N^{-1}|_{\dot{C}^{1,\gamma}}+|D(\varphi_r N^{-1})|_{\dot{C}^\gamma}+|D(\varphi_r M)|_{\dot{C}^\gamma}\\&\quad+|\partial_s(\varphi_r N^{-1})|_{\dot{C}^{1,\gamma}}+|t\partial_t(\varphi_r N^{-1})|_{\dot{C}^{1,\gamma}}\le C_1,\end{aligned}$$

for some constant C_1 and smaller $r = r_1$ depending only on $|g|_{C^5(\bar{D})}$ and the quantities in (4.1). Next, we proceed by induction. Assume, for some $k \geq 1$ and $r = r_k > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\varphi_r a_{ij}|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} + |\varphi_r N^{-1}|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} + |D(\varphi_r N^{-1})|_{\dot{C}^{k-1,\gamma}} + |D(\varphi_r M)|_{\dot{C}^{k-1,\gamma}} \\ &\quad + |\partial_s(\varphi_r N^{-1})|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} + |t\partial_t(\varphi_r N^{-1})|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} \leq C_k, \end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

where C_k and r_k are positive constants depending only on $|g|_{C^{4+k}(\bar{D})}$ and the quantities in (4.1). Applying Lemma 8.3 to (7.5) for $\alpha = k + \gamma$, we get

$$|D(\varphi_r N^{-1})|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} + |\partial_{ss}(\varphi_r N^{-1})|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} + |t(\varphi_r N^{-1})|_{\dot{C}^{k+2,\gamma}} \leq C_{k+1},$$

where $r = r_{k+1}$ and C_{k+1} are positive constants also depending on C^{4+k}-norm of g. This implies, with (7.6),

$$|t\partial_t(\varphi_r N^{-1})|_{\dot{C}^{k+1,\gamma}} + |D(\varphi_r M)|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} \leq C_{k+1}.$$

Thus we have completed the proof of (7.8) for $k + 1$.

Finally, differentiating (7.5) and (7.6) in t and using Lemma 8.3 we get estimates for higher order derivatives of N an M. Thus the present theorem has been proved. □

By combining Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 7.1, we obtain the following global estimate.

Theorem 7.2. *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer, Σ be an Alexandrov-Nirenberg surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of class C^{k+4}, with the induced metric g in D, and $\mathbf{r}$ be the position vector of Σ. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,*

$$|\mathbf{r}|_{C^{k,\alpha}(\bar{D})} \leq C\left(k, \alpha, |g|_{C^{k+3}(\bar{D})}, \max_{\partial D} \frac{1}{|\nabla K|}, \max_{\partial D} \frac{1}{|k_g|}\right).$$

Theorem 1.2 follows as a consequence of Theorem 7.2.

8. Appendix: $W^{2,p}$ Estimates and Schauder Estimates

In this section, we prove several regularity estimates for degenerate elliptic equations as (3.1) with characteristic degeneracy on boundary. Most related techniques and notations are used in [18].

For the sake of convenience, we first give a brief explanation. For $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, define $I_p(u)$ and $I_\alpha(u)$ by

$$I_p(u) = \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|u_t\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|u_{ss}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|t^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{st}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|tu_{tt}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)},$$

and

$$I_\alpha(u) = \|u\|_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} + \|u_t\|_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} + \|u_{ss}\|_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} + \|t^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{st}\|_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} + \|tu_{tt}\|_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)}.$$

For an α in $\mathbb{R}^1_+ \backslash \mathbb{Z}$, we define a function f in $\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$ if

$$\|f\|_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} = \sum_{|\beta| \leq [\alpha]} |D_x^\beta f|_{C(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} + [f]_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} < \infty, \tag{8.1}$$

where

$$[f]_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} = \sum_{|\beta| = [\alpha]} \sup_{y \geq 0, x \neq \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^1} \left(\frac{|D_x^\beta f(x, y) - D_x^\beta f(\bar{x}, y)|}{|x - \bar{x}|^{\alpha - [\alpha]}} \right). \tag{8.2}$$

It should be emphasized that the derivatives involved in $\dot{C}^\alpha$-norm are all x-directions. Denote by $\overline{W}^{2,p}$ as the completion of $C_c^\infty(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$ under the norm I_p.

For $a > 3/2$, consider a degenerate elliptic boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} &Lu = t\partial_t^2 u + a\partial_t u + \partial_{ss} u = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2_+, \\ &u \to 0 \text{ as } s^2+t^2 \to \infty \text{ and } u \text{ is bounded near } t = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{8.3}$$

We recall a result about a special solution $u = K(f)$. (See [18] for details.)

Theorem 8.1. *Let $a > 3/2$ be a constant and let $p \in [2, \infty)$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Then, for any $f \in C^\infty(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$ with $supp\{f\} \subset \{|s| \le T, 0 \le t \le T\}$, $u = K(f)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|tu_{tt}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|t^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{st}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|u_{ss}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|u_t\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} \\ &\quad \le C_{pT} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2_+)}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &[tu_{tt}]_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} + [t^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{st}]_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} + [u_{ss}]_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} + [u_t]_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} + |u|_{C(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} \\ &\quad \le C_{\alpha T} |f|_{\dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

for some universal constants C_{pT} and $C_{\alpha T}$ depending only on n, a and T, and p and α respectively.

In the following, we study the regularity of solutions of

$$\mathcal{L}u = tu_{tt} - ta_{12}u_{st} + a_{11}u_{ss} + b_2 u_t + b_1 u_s = f \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2_+. \tag{8.6}$$

Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$ be a cut-off function and $\varphi = 1$ in $B_{1/4}$. Define

$$\varphi_r(s,t) = \varphi\left(\frac{s}{r}, \frac{t}{r}\right).$$

Now we have two lemmas.

Lemma 8.2. *Let a_{12}, b_1 be bounded and a_{11} and b_2 be continuous near the origin $0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $a_{11}(0) = 1$ and $b_2(0) > 2$. Suppose $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2_+) \cap L^\infty_{loc}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$, with $tu_t, u_s \in L^2_{loc}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$, satisfies* (8.6)*, for some $f \in L^\infty_{loc}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$. Then, there exists an $r > 0$ such that*

$$\|D(\varphi_r u)\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|\varphi_r tu\|_{W^{2,6}(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|t^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi_r \partial_{st} u\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|\varphi_r \partial_s^2 u\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + |\varphi_r u|_{C^{\frac{2}{3}}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)} \le C,$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on the L^2-norms of $\varphi_{2r}u$, $\varphi_{2r}u_s$ and $t\varphi_{2r}u_t$, the modulus continuity of a_{11} and b_2 at 0, and the L^∞-norms of $\varphi_{2r}a_{12}$, $\varphi_{2r}b_1$ and $\varphi_{2r}f$.

Proof. We write

$$a_{11} = 1 + \bar{a}_{11},\ b_2 = a + \bar{b}_2 \text{ with } \bar{a}_{11}(0) = \bar{b}_2(0) = 0,\ a > 2, \tag{8.7}$$

for some continuous functions $\bar{a}_{11}$ and $\bar{b}_2$ and some constant a. Set $u_r = \varphi_r u$. Then u_r satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_1 u_r \equiv t\partial_{tt} u_r + \partial_{ss} u_r + a\partial_t u_r + Q(u_r) = f_r, \tag{8.8}$$

where

$$Q(u_r) = \varphi_{2r}\left(\bar{b}_2 \partial_t u_r - ta_{12}\partial_{ts} u_r + \bar{a}_{11}\partial_{ss} u_r\right),$$

and

$$f_r = (\mathcal{L}\varphi_r)u + 2t\partial_t\varphi_r u_t - 2ta_{12}\partial_s\varphi_r u_t - 2ta_{12}\partial_t\varphi_r u_s + 2\partial_s\varphi_r u_s \\ - b_1\partial_s u_r + \varphi_r f.$$

By the assumption of the present lemma, it is easy to see $f_r \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2_+)$. For some $\lambda \in (0,1]$, change the variables $s \to \lambda^{-1}s, t \to \lambda^{-2}t$, and still denote the new variables by s,t. Then equation (8.8) is reduced to

$$t\partial_{tt}u_r + \partial_{ss}u_r + a\partial_t u_r + Q_\lambda(u_r) = f_{r,\lambda} = \lambda^2 f_r, \tag{8.9}$$

where

$$Q_\lambda(u_r) = \varphi_{2r}\left(\bar{b}_2\partial_t u_r - \lambda t a_{12}\partial_{st}u_r + \bar{a}_{11}\partial_{ss}u_r\right).$$

Using the operator K in Theorem 8.1, we can rewrite (8.9) in an integral equation

$$u_r = R(u_r) = \lambda^2 K(f_r) - K(Q_\lambda(u_r)). \tag{8.10}$$

Set

$$I^* = I_2(K(f_r)),$$

and

$$S_2 = \{v \in \overline{W}^{2,2} : I_2(v) \le I^*\}.$$

We note, by Theorem 8.1,

$$I^* \le C\|f_r\|_{L^2}.$$

By (8.4), we have, for any $v \in S_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(R(v)) &\le \lambda^2 I_2(K(f_r)) + I_2(K(Q_\lambda(v))) \\ &\le \lambda^2 I^* + \left(\sup|\bar{b}_2\varphi_{2r}| + \sup|\bar{a}_{11}\varphi_{2r}| + \lambda\sup|\varphi_{2r}a_{12}|\right) I_2(v) \\ &\le \left(\lambda^2 + \frac{1}{2}\right) I^* \le I^*, \end{aligned}$$

if λ and r are chosen small enough. This follows from the assumptions on the continuity of $\bar{a}_{11}, \bar{b}_2$ at 0 and the boundedness of a_{12}. We also have

$$I_2(R(v_1) - R(v_2)) = I_2(Q_\lambda(v_1) - Q_\lambda(v_2)) \le \frac{1}{2} I_2(v_1 - v_2),$$

for some smaller λ and r. Then, by the contraction mapping principle, there exists a $v \in S_2$ such that

$$v = R(v) = -K(Q_\lambda(v)) + \lambda^2 K(f_r).$$

Pulling back to the original coordinates (s,t), we get

$$\mathcal{L}_1 v = tv_{tt} + v_{ss} + av_t + Q(v) = f_r,$$

and

$$I_2(v) \le C\|f_r\|_{L^2}, \tag{8.11}$$

for some constant C under control. Lemma 5.2 in [18] yields

$$|v(s,t)| \le \begin{cases} Ct^{-a+\frac{1}{2}} & \text{for } t \ge 4, \\ C|s|^{-1} & \text{for } |s| \ge 4, \end{cases}$$

and hence, for any $\delta > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \inf_{s^2+t^2=R^2} (u_r - v + \delta t^{\epsilon+1-a}) \geq 0.$$

Also by the definition of $I_2(v)$, we have $tv \in H^2(\Omega_1)$, where $\Omega_1 = \mathbb{R}^1 \times (0,1)$, and hence $tv \in C^\alpha(B_R(0) \cap \bar{\Omega}_1)$, for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$, by the Sobolev embedding. Fixing $\epsilon > 0$ such that $a > 2 + \epsilon$, we have, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{|s|\leq R,\, t\to 0} (u_r - v + \delta t^{\epsilon+1-a}) \\
&\geq \inf_{|s|\leq R,\, t\to 0} t^{\epsilon+1-a} \left(t^{a-1-\epsilon} u_r + \frac{\delta}{2} \right) + \inf_{|s|\leq R,\, t\to 0} \frac{1}{t} \left(-tv + \frac{\delta}{2} t^{\epsilon+2-a} \right) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{L}_1(t^{\epsilon+1-a}) = (\epsilon + 1 - a)(\epsilon + \varphi_{2r}\bar{b}_2) t^{\epsilon-a} \leq 0,$$

for some smaller r independent of δ. Hence,

$$\mathcal{L}_1(u_r - v \pm \delta t^{\epsilon+1-a}) \lesseqgtr 0.$$

Then an application of the maximum principle yields

$$|u_r - v| \leq \delta t^{\epsilon+1-a}.$$

Passing to the limit $\delta \to 0$, we have $u_r = v$. Therefore from (8.11) and the definition of $I_2(v)$ it follows that, for some constant C under control,

$$\int t(\partial_t \partial_s u_r)^2 + (\partial_{ss} u_r)^2 \leq C,$$

which implies $\partial_s u_r \in L^6(\mathbb{R}^2_+)$ by (5.1). So far we have proved $t\partial_t u_r, \partial_s u_r \in L^6(\mathbb{R}^2_+)$. Repeating the same arguments, we can prove that $I_6(u_r)$ is bounded for a smaller r and hence, $\partial_t u_r, \partial_s u_r \in L^6(\mathbb{R}^2_+)$. Using the Sobolev embedding theorem, we have $u_r \in C^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$ with $\alpha = 2/3$. This ends the proof of the present lemma. □

Lemma 8.3. *In addition to the hypotheses in Lemma 8.2, we assume, for some* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^1_+ \setminus \mathbb{Z}$,

$$a_{12}, a_{11}, b_2, b_1 \in \dot{C}^\alpha(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+), \quad f \in \dot{C}^\alpha_{loc}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+),$$

and

$$u, tu_t, u_s \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2_+) \cap \dot{C}^\alpha_{loc}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+).$$

Then, there exists an $r = r(\alpha) > 0$ *such that*

$$I_\alpha(\varphi_r u) \leq C,$$

where C *is a positive constant depending only on* α, *the* $\dot{C}^\alpha$*-norms of* $\varphi_{2r}u$, $\varphi_{2r}u_s$, $t\varphi_{2r}u_t$ *and* $\varphi_{2r}f$, *and the* $\dot{C}^\alpha$*-norms of* $\varphi_{2r}a_{12}$, $\varphi_{2r}a_{11}$, $\varphi_{2r}b_2$ *and* $\varphi_{2r}b_1$.

The proof is similar to that of Lemma 8.2 and is omitted.

Now we prove a regularity result.

Theorem 8.4. *Let* a_{12}, a_{11}, b_2, b_1 *and* f *be* C^∞ *in* $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+$ *with* $a_{11} > 0$ *and* $b_2(s,0) > 2$, *and* u *be a solution of* (8.6) *with* $t^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_t u, \partial_s u \in L^2_{loc}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+)$. *Then* u *is* C^∞ *in* $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^2_+$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the smoothness near $(s,t)=(0,0)$. First, by Lemma 8.2, we have, for some cutoff function φ_r,

$$\|\varphi_r u\|_{W^{1,6}(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|t\varphi_r u\|_{W^{2,6}(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|\varphi_r \partial_s^2 u\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} + \|t^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi_r \partial_{st} u\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2_+)} \le C.$$

By the Sobolev embedding in [18](Lemma B.3), we have, for $\gamma = 1-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{2}{6}=\frac{1}{6}$,

$$|\varphi_r u|_{C^\gamma} + |\varphi_r t\partial_t u|_{C^\gamma} + |\varphi_r \partial_s u|_{C^\gamma} \le C. \tag{8.12}$$

Next, we apply Lemma 8.3 by taking $\alpha=\gamma$. Hence,

$$I_\gamma(\varphi_r u) \le C_1,$$

and, in particular,

$$|\varphi_r u|_{\dot{C}^{1,\gamma}} + |D(\varphi_r u)|_{\dot{C}^\gamma} + |\partial_s(\varphi_r u)|_{\dot{C}^{1,\gamma}} + |t\partial_t(\varphi_r u)|_{\dot{C}^{1,\gamma}} \le C_1,$$

for some constant C_1 and smaller $r=r_1$. Next, we proceed by induction. Assume, for some $k\ge 1$ and $r=r_k>0$,

$$|\varphi_r u|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} + |D(\varphi_r u)|_{\dot{C}^{k-1,\gamma}} + |\partial_s(\varphi_r u)|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} + |t\partial_t(\varphi_r u)|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} \le C_k. \tag{8.13}$$

Applying Lemma 8.3 to (8.6) for $\alpha = k+\gamma$, we get

$$|D(\varphi_r u)|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} + |\partial_{ss}(\varphi_r u)|_{\dot{C}^{k,\gamma}} + |t(\varphi_r u)|_{\dot{C}^{k+2,\gamma}} \le C_{k+1},$$

where $r=r_{k+1}$ and C_{k+1} are positive constants. This implies

$$|t\partial_t(\varphi_r u)|_{\dot{C}^{k+1,\gamma}} \le C_{k+1}.$$

Thus we have completed the proof of (8.13) for $k+1$.

Finally, differentiating (8.6) and using Lemma 8.3, we get estimates for higher order derivatives of u. Thus the present theorem has been proved. □

References

[1] Adams, R.A., Fournier, J., *Sobolev Spaces, 2nd Edition*, Academic Press, 2003.

[2] Alexandrov, A.D., *On a class of closed surface*, Recueil Math. (Moscow), 4(1938), 69-77.

[3] Cheng, S.-Y, Yau, S.-T., *On the regularity of the Monge-Ampere equation* $\det(\partial^2 u/\partial x_i \partial x_j) = F(x,u)$, Comm. Pure Appl.Math. 30(1977), 41-68.

[4] Cohn-Vossen, S. E., *Zwei Sätze über die Starrheit der Eiflächen*, Nach. Gesellschaft Wiss. Göttinger, Math. Phys. Kl.(1927), 125-134.

[5] Guan, P.-F., Li, Y.-Y., *The Weyl problem with nonnegative Gauss curvature*, J. Diff. Geometry, 39(1994), 331-342.

[6] Gromov, M., Rokhlin, V.A., *Embeddings and immersions in Riemannian geometry*, Russian Mathematical Surveys, 25(1970), 1-57.

[7] Gilbarg, D., Trudinger, N.S., *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.

[8] Han, Q., *On the isometric embedding of surfaces with Gauss curvature changing sign cleanly*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 58(2005), 285-295.

[9] Han, Q., *Local isometric embedding of surfaces with Gauss curvature changing sign stably across a curve*, Cal. Var. & P.D.E., 25(2005), 79-103.

[10] Han, Q., Hong, J.-X., *Isometric embedding of Riemannian manifolds in Euclidean spaces*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006.

[11] Han, Q., Hong, J.-X., Lin, C.-S., *Local isometric embedding of surfaces with nonpositive gaussian curvature*, J. Diff. Geometry, 63(2003), 475-520.

[12] Han, Q., Khuri, M., *Local isometric embedding of surfaces with Gauss curvature of mixed sign*, Comm. Analysis & Geometry, 18(2010), 649-704.
[13] Han, Q., Lin, F.-H., *On the isometric embedding of Torus in* $\mathbb{R}^3$, Methods Appl. Anal., 15(2008), 197-204.
[14] Han, Q., Lin, F.-H., *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations, 2nd Edition*, Courant Institute Lecture Notes, Volume 1, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.
[15] Heinz, E., *Neue a priori Abschatsungen fur den ortsvektor iener Flache positiver Gaussscher Krummung durch ihr Linienelment*, Math. Z., 74(1960), 1-52.
[16] Herglotz, G., *Über die Starrheit der Eiflächen*, Abh. Math. Sem. Hansischen Univ., 15(1943), 127-129.
[17] Hong, J.-X, *Darboux equations and isometric embedding of Riemannian manifolds with nonnegative curvature in* $\mathbb{R}^3$, Chin. Ann. of Math., 20B(1999), 123-136.
[18] Hong, J.-X., Huang, G.-G., *L^p and Hölder estimates for a class of degenerate elliptic partial differential equations and its applications*, Inter.Math.R.N, Vol. 2012, No.13, pp.2889-2941.
[19] Hong, J.-X., Huang, G.-G., Wang, W.-Y., *Existence of Global smooth solutions to Dirichlet problem for degenerate elliptic Monge-Ampère equations*, Comm. in Partial Diff. Equations, 36(2011), no.4,635-656.
[20] Hong, J.-X., Zuily, C., *Isometric embedding of the 2-sphere with nonnegative curvature in* $\mathbb{R}^3$, Math. Z., 219(1995), 323-334.
[21] Lin, C.-S., *The local isometric embedding in* $\mathbb{R}^3$ *of 2-dimensional Riemannian manifolds with nonnegative curvature*, J. Diff. Geometry, 21(1985), 213-230.
[22] Lin, C.-S., *The local isometric embedding in* $\mathbb{R}^3$ *of two dimensional Riemannian manifolds with Gaussian curvature changing sign cleanly*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 39(1986), 867-887.
[23] Li, C.-H., *The analyticity of solutions to a class of degenerate elliptic equations*, Sci. China Math., 53(2010), 2061-2068.
[24] Keldys, M.V., *On certain cases of degeneration of equations of elliptic type on the boundary of a domain*, Dokl Akad. Nauk SSSR, 77(1951), 181-183.
[25] Nirenberg, L., *The Weyl and Minkowski problems in differential geometry in the large*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 6(1953), 337-394.
[26] Nirenberg, L., *Rigidity of a class of closed surfaces*, edited by Lang, 177-193, University of Wisconsin Press, 1963.
[27] Pogorelov, A.V., *Regularity of a convex surface with given Gaussian curvature* (Russian), Mat. Sbornik (N.S.), 31(1952), 88-103.
[28] Sacksteder, R., *The rigidity of hypersurfaces*, J. Math. Mech., 11(1962), 929-939.
[29] Weyl, H., *Über die Bestimmheit einer geschlossenen konvex Fläche durch ihr Linienelement*, Vierteljahresschrift der nat.-Forsch. Ges. Zürich, 61(1916), 40-72.
[30] Yau, S.-T., *Problem section*, Seminar on Differential Geometry, Princeton University Press, 1982.
[31] Yau, S.-T., *Lecture on Differential Geometry*, in Berkeley, 1977.
[32] Yau, S.-T., *Survey on geometry and analysis*, Asian J. Math., 4(2000), 235-278.

Department of Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA
E-mail address: qhan@nd.edu

Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, China
E-mail address: qhan@math.pku.edu.cn

School of Mathematical Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, 200433, China
E-mail address: jxhong@fudan.edu.cn

School of Mathematical Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, 200433, China
E-mail address: genggenghuang@fudan.edu.cn